

**THE BOOK WAS
DRENCHED**

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_214269

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No.

Accession No.

Author

Title

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

THE
ANNUAL REGISTER
1918

ALL THE VOLUMES OF THE NEW SERIES OF THE

ANNUAL REGISTER

1863 to 1915

MAY BE HAD

Price 16s. net each.

1916. 21s. *net.* | **1917.** 24s. *net.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.,

LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS.

THE
ANNUAL REGISTER



REVIEW OF PUBLIC EVENTS AT HOME
AND ABROAD

FOR THE YEAR

1918

NEW SERIES

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, & CO., LTD.; S. G. MADGWICK
JOHN MURRAY; J. & E. BUMPUS, LTD.
BICKERS & SON; J. WHELDON & CO.; R. & T. WASHBOURNE, LTD.
1919

CONTENTS.

PART I.

THE EUROPEAN WAR.

CHAPTER I.

NEW YEAR TO MARCH 21.

Review of the Situation, [1]. Armistice between Germany and Russia, [2]. The Strategic Situation, [3]. Peace Negotiations at Brest-Litovsk, [4]. Russo-German Negotiations, [5]. Refusal of Allies to take part in the Negotiations, [6]. Negotiations Resumed, [7]. A Deadlock, [8]. The Ukrainian Peace, [9]. Invasion of Ukraina, [10]. New German Advance in Russia, [11]. Terms of the Treaty, [12]. Treaty Signed at Brest-Litovsk, [13]. New Political Boundaries, [14]. Destruction of Russian Unity, [15]. Strategic Position in Europe, [16]. The War at Sea, [17]. Sinking of the *Breslau*, [18]. Aerial Warfare, [19]. Raids on England, [20].

CHAPTER II.

THE LAST GERMAN OFFENSIVE.

Exhaustion of Central Europe, [20]. The Position in March, [21]. The German Offensive, [22]. The British Retreat, [23]. Bombardment of Paris, [24]. Battle of Arras, [25]. Fresh German Offensive, [26]. Battle of Armentières, [27]. General Foch Appointed to the Supreme Command, [28]. The Germans Capture Soissons, [29]. Austro-Hungarian Offensive against Italy, [30]. End of the German Offensive, [31].

CHAPTER III.

THE VICTORY OF THE ASSOCIATED POWERS.

Effects of Naval Pressure, [31]. Opening of the Allied Offensive, [32]. Advance by General Rawlinson, [33]. Further Allied Advances, [34]. Recapture of Ostend, [35]. Conclusion of Armistice, [36]. Defeat of Bulgaria, [37]. The War at Sea, [38]. Depredation by Submarines, [39]. Progress of Ship-building, [40]. The Attack on Zeebrugge, [41]. Blocking the Entrance to Ostend, [42]. Maritime Incidents, [43]. The Aerial War, [44]. The German Armistice, [45]. Casualties of the War, [46].

ENGLISH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

A STORMY WINTER.

New Year Message from the Prime Minister, [47]. The Food Situation, [48]. Meat Rationing, [49]. Military Service Bill, [50]. Reform Bill, [51-53]. National Expenditure, [53]. Prorogation of Parliament, [54]. Banking Amalgamations, [55]. Promotion of Commerce and Industry, [56]. General Meat Rationing Scheme, [57]. New Session of Parliament, [58]. Food Policy, [59-60]. The Versailles Council, [60]. Criticism in Parliament, [61]. Army Estimates, [62]. Food Policy, [63]. Vote of Credit, [64]. The Government and the Press, [65]. Education Bill, [66]. Second Reading Debate, [67-68]. The Shipbuilding Question, [68]. Unrest in Ireland, [69]. Conference of the Labour Party, [70].

CHAPTER II.

MAN-POWER AND MONEY-POWER.

Re-assembling of Parliament, [71]. New Military Service Bill, [71]. Its Provisions, [72]. Second Reading Debate, [73]. Criticism by Mr. Asquith, [74]. Passed into Law, [75]. Report of the Irish Convention, [76]. The Budget, [77]. Chancellor of the Exchequer's Speech, [78-79]. Debate, [79]. Chancellor's Reply, [80]. Resignation of General Trenchard, [81]. Debate, [82]. Letter of General Maurice to *The Times*, [83]. Questions in Parliament, [84]. Debate on the Maurice Letter, [85]. Economic Policy, [86]. Increase of Railway Fares, [87]. The Whitsun Recess, [87]. Conspiracy in Ireland, [88]. The Ministry of Pensions, [89]. The Education Bill, [89-90]. Finance Bill in Committee, [90]. Irish Affairs, [91]. The Food Situation, [92]. Work of the Post Office, [93]. Vote of Credit, [94]. Control of National Expenditure, [95]. Finance Bill (Third Reading), [96]. The Trade Boards Bill, [97]. The Imperial War Cabinet, [98]. Conference of the Labour Party, [99]. End of the Political Truce, [100]. National Housing, [101]. Progress in Food Control, [102]. Prime Minister's Appeal to Women, [103]. National Kitchens, [103]. Standard Clothing, [104]. "A Scandalous Trial," [105].

CHAPTER III.

ALARMS AND FEARS.

Celebration of Their Majesty's Silver Wedding, [106]. Address from the City of London, [107]. The King's Reply, [107-109]. Position of Enemy Aliens, [110]. Debates in Parliament, [111]. British Nationality and Status of Aliens Bill, [112]. Debate in the Commons, [113]. Debate in the Lords, [114]. Education Bill, [115]. Vote of Credit, [115-116]. The Financial Situation, [117]. Shipbuilding Policy, [118]. Exchange of Prisoners, [119]. Extension of the Life of Parliament, [120]. Ministerial Appointments, [121]. Strike in the Midlands, [122]. The Position in Ireland, [123]. Indian Constitutional Reforms, [124]. Imperial War Conference, [125]. The Military Situation, [126]. Progress of Rationing, [127]. Rationing of Coal, [128]. Fourth Anniversary of the War, [129].

CONTENTS.

vii

CHAPTER IV.

THE STRAIN AT ITS HEIGHT.

Strike of Omnibus Conductresses, [130]. Strike of London Police, [131]. Settlement of the Strike, [132]. Debate in Parliament, [133]. Strike of Lancashire Cotton Spinners, [134]. Demands of Railwaymen, [135]. Railway Strike, [136]. Trade Union Congress, [137]. Influenza Epidemic, [138]. Serious Coal Shortage, [139]. The Food Situation, [140]. British Prisoners in Germany, [141]. Debate in the Commons, [142]. New Scale of Separation Allowances, [143]. Prospects of a General Election, [144]. Election of Women to Parliament, [145]. The Irish Question, [146]. Ministry of Health Bill, [147]. War Bond Campaign, [148]. Methods of Propaganda, [149].

CHAPTER V.

PEACE.

Announcement of the Armistice, [150]. Celebrations in London, [151]. Re-establishment of Industry, [152]. Vote of Credit, [153]. Addresses from Parliament to the King, [154]. Dissolution of Parliament, [155]. The Election Campaign, [156]. Attitude of the Labour Party, [157]. Coalition Manifesto, [158-162]. Resignations from the Government, [162]. Continuance of the Election Campaign, [163]. Result of the Election, [164]. Commencement of Demobilisation, [165]. Industrial Unrest, [166]. National War Savings, [167]. Visit of President Wilson, [168]. His Anticipations for the Future, [169].

FOREIGN AND COLONIAL HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

FRANCE AND ITALY page [170]

CHAPTER II.

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY [180]

CHAPTER III.

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE—THE MUSCOVITE REPUBLIC—
UKRAINIA—SIBERIA—POLAND—FINLAND—OTHER RUSSIAN STATES—
TURKEY—RUMANIA—BULGARIA—GREECE—SERBIA—MONTENEGRO—
ALBANIA [228]

CHAPTER IV.

LESSER STATES OF WESTERN AND NORTHERN EUROPE: BELGIUM—
LUXEMBURG—THE NETHERLANDS—SWITZERLAND—LIECHTENSTEIN—
SPAIN—PORTUGAL—DENMARK AND ICELAND—SWEDEN—NORWAY—
SPITSBERGEN [247]

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER V.

| | |
|---|-----------|
| SOUTHERN ASIA: CYPRUS—THE HEJAZ—PERSIA—AFGHANISTAN—INDIA—SIAM | page [264 |
|---|-----------|

CHAPTER VI.

| | |
|---|------|
| THE FAR EAST: CHINA—JAPAN—NETHERLANDS EAST INDIES | [279 |
|---|------|

CHAPTER VII.

| | |
|---|------|
| AFRICA: THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA—SOUTH-WEST AFRICA—RHODESIA—MADAGASCAR—PORTUGUESE EAST AFRICA—BRITISH AND GERMAN EAST AFRICA—LIBERIA—THE BELGIAN CONGO—NIGERIA—MOROCCO—ABYSSINIA—EGYPT—THE SUDAN | [278 |
|---|------|

CHAPTER VIII.

| | |
|--|------|
| AMERICA: THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ITS DEPENDENCIES—CANADA—NEWFOUNDLAND—MEXICO—BRAZIL—ARGENTINA—CHILI—OTHER REPUBLICS | [288 |
|--|------|

CHAPTER IX.

| | |
|--|------|
| AUSTRALASIA: AUSTRALIA—NEW ZEALAND | [313 |
|--|------|

PART II.

| | |
|--|--------|
| CHRONICLE OF EVENTS IN 1918 | page 1 |
| RETROSPECT OF LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART IN 1918 | 23 |
| Literature, 23—Science, 60—Art, 69—Drama, 71—Music, 73. | |
| FINANCE AND COMMERCE IN 1918 | 76 |
| PUBLIC DOCUMENTS | 82 |
| Summary of the Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms, 82—Despatch from Sir Douglas Haig, describing the Retreat in March, 101—Terms of the Armistice with Turkey, 149—Terms of the Armistice with Austria-Hungary, 151—Terms of the Armistice with Germany, 153. | |
| OBITUARY OF EMINENT PERSONS DECEASED IN 1918 | 159 |
| INDEX | 215 |

PREFATORY NOTE.

THE Editor of the ANNUAL REGISTER thinks it necessary to state that in no case does he claim to offer original reports of speeches in Parliament or elsewhere. He has much pleasure in acknowledging his indebtedness to *The Times* for the special permission accorded him to make use of its Parliamentary reports and other matter ; and he hereby expresses his thanks to that journal for the valuable assistance which he has derived from the facilities thus extended to him.

THE MINISTRY, 1918.

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury</i> . . . | Mr. D. Lloyd George. |
| <i>Lord President of the Council</i> . . . | Earl Curzon of Kedleston, K.G. |
| <i>Chancellor of the Exchequer</i> . . . | Mr. A. Bonar Law. |
| <i>Ministers without Portfolio</i> . . . | Viscount Milner, G.C.B. (<i>till April 19</i>); then Mr. Austen Chamberlain. Sir Edward Carson, K.C. (<i>res. Jan. 21</i>). Mr. George N. Barnes. Lieut.-Gen. Jan C. Smuts. |

The above formed the War Cabinet.

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>Lord Chancellor</i> . . . | Lord Finlay, G.C.M.G. |
| <i>Lord Privy Seal</i> . . . | Earl of Crawford. |
| <i>First Lord of the Admiralty</i> . . . | Sir Eric Geddes, G.B.E. |
| <i>Secretaries of State :—</i> | |
| <i>Home Affairs</i> . . . | Sir George Cave, K.C. |
| <i>Foreign Affairs</i> . . . | Mr. Arthur J. Balfour, O.M. |
| <i>Colonies</i> . . . | Mr. Walter Long. |
| <i>India</i> . . . | Hon. E. S. Montagu. |
| <i>War</i> . . . | Earl of Derby (<i>till April 19</i>); then Viscount Milner, G.C.B. |
| <i>Royal Air Force</i> . . . | Lord Rothermere (<i>res. April 25</i>); then Lord Weir. |
| <i>Minister of Munitions</i> . . . | Mr. Winston S. Churchill. |
| <i>Director of National Service</i> . . . | Sir Auckland Geddes, K.C.B. |
| <i>Minister of Labour</i> . . . | Mr. G. H. Roberts. |
| <i>Pensions Minister</i> . . . | Mr. J. Hodge. |
| <i>Minister of Reconstruction</i> . . . | Dr. C. Addison. |
| <i>Minister of Blockade</i> . . . | Lord Robert Cecil, K.C. (<i>till July 19</i>); then Sir L. Worthington-Evans, Bart. |
| <i>Food Controller</i> . . . | Viscount Rhondda (<i>d. July 3</i>); then Mr. J. R. Clynes. |
| <i>Shipping Controller</i> . . . | Sir J. P. Maclay, Bart. |
| <i>President of the Board of Trade</i> . . . | Sir Albert Stanley. |
| <i>President of the Local Government Board</i> . . . | Mr. W. Hayes Fisher (<i>res. Nov. 4</i>); then Sir Auckland Geddes, K.C.B. |
| <i>Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster</i> . . . | Lord Beaverbrook (<i>res. Oct.</i>); then Lord Downham. |
| <i>Chief Secretary for Ireland</i> . . . | Mr. H. E. Duke, K.C. (<i>till May 6</i>); then Mr. Edward Shortt, K.C. |
| <i>Secretary for Scotland</i> . . . | Mr. Robert Munro, K.C. |
| <i>President of the Board of Agriculture</i> . . . | Mr. R. E. Prothero, M.V.O. |
| <i>First Commissioner of Works</i> . . . | Sir Alfred Mond, Bart. |
| <i>President of the Board of Education</i> . . . | Mr. H. A. L. Fisher. |
| <i>Postmaster-General</i> . . . | Mr. A. Illingworth. |
| <i>Attorney-General</i> . . . | Sir F. E. Smith, Bart., K.C. |
| <i>Solicitor-General</i> . . . | Sir Gordon Hewart, K.C. |
| <i>Civil Lord of the Admiralty</i> . . . | Mr. E. G. Pretymann. |
| <i>Financial Secretaries :—</i> | |
| <i>To the Treasury</i> . . . | Sir S. H. Lever, K.C.B.; Mr. Stanley Baldwin. |
| <i>To the War Office</i> . . . | Mr. H. W. Forster. |
| <i>Parliamentary and Financial Secretary to the Admiralty</i> . . . | Dr. T. J. Macnamara. |
| <i>Parliamentary Secretaries to the Treasury</i> . . . | Lord Edmund Talbot, M.V.O. Hon. Frederick Guest, D.S.O. |

Parl. Under-Secretaries:—

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|---|
| <i>Home Office</i> | . . . | Mr. W. Brace. |
| <i>Foreign Office</i> | . . . | Lord Robert Cecil, K.C. (as Assistant Secretary of State from July 19). |
| <i>Colonial Office</i> | . . . | Mr. W. A. S. Hewins. |
| <i>India Office</i> | . . . | Lord Islington, G.C.M.G. |
| <i>War Office</i> | . . . | Mr. Ian Macpherson. |
| <i>Air Council</i> | . . . | Major J. L. Baird, C.M.G. |
| <i>Ministry of Munitions</i> | . { | Sir L. Worthington-Evans, Bart. (till July 19); then Maj.-Gen. J. E. B. Seely, C.B., D.S.O. |
| | | Mr. F. G. Kellaway. |
| <i>Ministry of National Service</i> | . . . | Mr. Cecil Beck. |
| <i>Ministry of Labour</i> | . . . | Mr. W. C. Bridgeman. |
| <i>Pensions Ministry</i> | . . . | Sir A. Griffith-Boscawen. |
| <i>Ministry of Blockade</i> | . . . | Lord Robert Cecil, K.C. (till July 19); then Mr. Leverton Harris. |
| <i>Ministry of Food</i> | . . . | Mr. J. R. Clynes (till July 3); then Major Hon. Waldorf Astor. |
| <i>Ministry of Shipping</i> | . . . | Sir L. G. C. Money. |
| <i>Board of Trade</i> | . . . | Mr. G. J. Wardle, C.H. |
| <i>Local Government Board</i> | . . . | Mr. Stephen Walsh. |
| <i>Board of Agriculture</i> | . { | Sir Richard Winfrey. |
| | | Lord Clinton. |
| <i>Board of Education</i> | . . . | Mr. J. H. Lewis. |
| <i>Paymaster-General</i> | . . . | Sir J. Compton Rickett. |
| <i>Assistant Postmaster-General</i> | . . . | Mr. H. Pike Pease. |
| <i>Junior Lords of the Treasury</i> | . { | Mr. J. F. Hope; Mr. J. W. Pratt; Mr. J. Parker, C.H.; Mr. J. T. Jones. |

SCOTLAND.

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| <i>Lord-Advocate</i> | . . . | Mr. J. A. Clyde, K.C. |
| <i>Solicitor-General</i> | . . . | Mr. T. B. Morison, K.C. |

IRELAND.

| | | |
|------------------------|-------|--|
| <i>Lord Lieutenant</i> | . . . | Lord Wimborne (till May 6); then Viscount French. |
| <i>Lord Chancellor</i> | . . . | Sir Ignatius O'Brien, Bart., K.C. (till June 5); then Sir James H. Campbell, Bart., K.C. |

ANNUAL REGISTER

FOR THE YEAR

1918.

PART I.

THE EUROPEAN WAR.

CHAPTER I.

NEW YEAR TO MARCH 21.

AT the beginning of the year 1918 the first great phase of the war may be said to have terminated. From the opening of hostilities until the end of 1917 the most obvious and the most essential characteristic of the war on land was that it was a double war. There existed the two main theatres of operations, the Russian Front and the French Front, which were throughout of approximately equal importance, both strategically and politically. And although hostilities were also proceeding in a number of other regions, it is nevertheless true to describe the land war as double rather than multiple, for the operations in Russia and France far transcended in importance those in any other area, even the Balkan and Italian theatres, all such other operations being of quite minor significance. But the course of the war in the East had been unfortunate for the Entente Powers. The great Russian defeats of 1915 had been of a most crushing character, and although the Tsar's armies, under the leadership of those justly famous commanders, Alexeieff and Brusiloff, had made a most remarkable and valiant recovery in 1916, they were unable to reverse the decision gained by the enemy in the Warsaw campaign. Thus at the time of the Revolution in March, 1917, the Russian Army was a defeated army, and it was consequently all too ready to accept excuses for the condition of passivity into which it immediately sank. And it should be remembered that many of the soldiers had witnessed and experienced the agonies and the despair which

were consequent upon the tragic lack of munitions and other supplies during 1915, and their dissatisfaction with the old regime is thus comprehensible. For eight months longer the Russian Army, though almost wholly passive, remained "in being"; but after the Bolshevik *coup d'état* in November, the Army as such ceased to exist, and the Germans saw that formidable living wall, which for so many months had resisted their attempts to compass its destruction, rapidly crumble to pieces and vanish. Thus at the opening of the year, Prince Leopold of Bavaria, the German Emperor's commander in the East, was looking out over a stupendous ocean of violent anarchy, but he was no longer confronting an organised enemy.

In December, 1917, a formal armistice was concluded between the Central Empires and the new extremist Government in Petrograd, and before the end of the year these Powers entered into negotiations for peace. After a preliminary exchange of views in December,¹ the main negotiations took place in January and February, but before proceeding to recount these events, it will be well to describe briefly the geographic positions of the opposing forces in the different theatres of war.

In the Western theatre only one change of any considerable magnitude had been effected during 1917. The line of the German Army still commenced on the coast of the North Sea, near Westende, and from thence ran southwards, east of Ypres and west of La Bassée and Lens, and then east of Arras. It was in the district south of Arras that the Allies had achieved a considerable gain of ground in the spring of 1917. The German line had receded and now ran across a spot about midway between Bapaume and Cambrai, and then passed immediately to the west of St. Quentin and La Fère. It continued in a southerly direction across the Ailette, and then, before reaching the Aisne, turned sharply eastwards. About 20 miles further east, the German line crossed to the left bank of the Aisne, ran immediately north of Rheims, continued eastwards and again crossed the Aisne (near its source), and crossed the Meuse about 5 miles north of Verdun. The line then turned southwards and passed west of St. Mihiel, then ran north and east of Nancy into Alsace, and terminated on the Swiss frontier, very close to the spot at which France, Germany, and Switzerland met.

In the Italian theatre, the Austro-Hungarian forces had made a very considerable advance during 1917. From Switzerland eastwards past Lake Garda, the Austrian line ran along the frontier, and east of Lake Garda it crossed the frontier into Italian territory. The line then ran across the upper reaches of the Piave, and then down the left bank of that river to the Adriatic. It will be noticed that the Italians had thus been driven back a considerable distance during the previous year.

¹ See A.R., 1917, p. 42.

In January, 1917, they were on the left bank of the Isonzo, in Austrian territory. They were now on the right bank of the Piave, only 20 miles from Venice.

In the Balkan theatre, from which Rumania was strategically excluded, there had been no change of any importance during 1917. The Central Empires and their Bulgarian and Turkish Allies occupied all Montenegro, the northern two-thirds of Albania, all Serbia except the town and immediate environs of Monastir, and also the eastern portion of Greece, including the port of Kavalla.

In the main Eastern theatre, with which the Rumanian Front must be included, certain fairly important geographic changes, to the advantage of the Central Empires, had taken place during 1917. But the most important development had not been any one of these geographical changes, but the extraordinary progressive degeneration of the Russian Army. A great army had become metamorphosed into an anarchic mass of leaderless and spiritless men. The process, beginning with mere indiscipline in March, reached an advanced stage of disintegration after the Bolshevik *coup d'état* in November, but owing to the armistice which was then concluded this dissolution of the Muscovite force did not lead to any immediate advance on the part of the Austro-German armies. Such advances were made ultimately, as will be seen shortly, but these movements were not carried out until after the armistice had been interrupted in February. The Austro-German positions were therefore those that had been established early in the previous autumn. The German line began on the Baltic coast about 40 miles north-east of Riga, that town having been captured in 1917. The line ran south-west and passed west of Düna (Dvinsk), which the Russians still occupied, and then continued to the neighbourhood of the railway junction of Molodetchno, the junction itself remaining, however, in Russian hands. The line continued southwards, cutting the main Warsaw-Moscow railway about 50 miles west of Minsk, immediately to the east of the junction of Baranovitche. At the town of Pinsk the German line entered the region of the famous Pripiet Marshes. Pinsk itself was held by the invaders. Across the wide area of the swamps the lines had always been thinly held, both by Germans and Russians, for on this terrain extensive manoeuvres were impracticable. In the vast theatre lying south of the Pripiet Marshes, extending as far as the Black Sea, the hostile armies were composed mainly of Austro-Hungarian troops, although German, as well as Bulgarian and Turkish, forces were also present. Immediately to the south of the Pripiet the Austro-German line ran along the left bank of the tributary stream named the Stokhod, and passed about 20 miles eastward of the railway junction of Kovel. The opposing lines met the Galician frontier a short distance to the east of the point at which the river Styr leaves that province, and then passed along

the Austro-Russian frontier, with which, indeed, they were almost coincident, even to the ultimate point, at which Russia, Bukovina, and Rumania met. In this district the enemy had gained large territorial advantages in 1917. The Austrians had reconquered the greater part of eastern Galicia and the whole of Bukovina. In Rumania the Austro-Hungarian line struck straight across the country, and, for the greater part of its length, ran a few miles south-west of the river Sereth. The whole of that district of Rumania which lay between the Danube and the Black Sea, that is, the district known as the Dobrudja, had been in the hands of the Germans and Bulgarians since 1916. It will be noticed that the situation in Rumania had undergone no important changes during 1917.

It remains to state the position in the Middle East, where Armenia and Persia together constituted a single theatre of war. The Russian line had fluctuated but little during the previous year. The right wing rested upon the coast of the Black Sea a few miles west of Trebizond; and the line then passed away south of Erzerum and Mush and south of Lake Van into Persia. In Persia the Russian force had become very disorganised by the end of 1917. In the spring of 1917 a small Russian army had taken Harunabad, and had advanced further to the south-west until it had established contact with the British force in Mesopotamia. But later in the year this Russian force was withdrawn, and at the time of the armistice the disorderly troops of the Muscovite Republic only held Tabriz and northern Azerbaijan. It will be remembered that in the Middle East, even in the Armenian sector, continuous lines of trench-fortifications, such as were to be seen on the Western and Russian Fronts, had never existed at any period of the war.

THE PEACE NEGOTIATIONS AT BREST-LITOVSK.

The military conflict on the various fronts had reached the stage outlined above when one-half of the land-war was definitely suspended by the action of M. Lenin's Government, which, immediately after it had seized control of Petrograd, concluded an armistice with the Central Powers and forthwith entered into peace negotiations with them. The conference took place at Brest-Litovsk, and the negotiations were opened before the end of the year.¹ At the commencement the relations between the negotiators were fairly amicable, for at first both sides had the same object in view, though their respective motives were dissimilar. Both sides desired to convert the negotiations thus commenced into a general peace conference. It was notorious that the Governments of the Central Powers had long been using every means, both open and secret, to obtain a peace by compromise (it was, of course, almost unthinkable that the

¹ See A.R., 1917, p. 47.

Central Powers should ever be in a position to dictate terms unconditionally), and hence they hoped to see the Western Powers participating in the conference. On the other hand, the Russian Government were well aware that they would be able to obtain much more tolerable terms from their victorious enemies if they could negotiate conjointly with the undefeated Western Powers. A general conference would be a discussion between equals. The separate negotiations between Russia and the enemy could only be a debate between victors and vanquished. The Russian Government publicly invited the other Entente Powers to join in the armistice, but when the Allied Governments made no response, the Russian delegates concluded a formal armistice of twenty-eight days' duration, to commence on December 17. The armistice was to continue beyond the twenty-eighth day, January 14, unless and until one party gave seven days' notice to terminate it. The other terms of the armistice agreement aimed at the maintenance of the military *status quo*, save in regard to Persia, which was to be evacuated by both parties. The first Russian suggestions for peace terms were: (1) No forcible annexation of conquered territories. (2) Complete restoration of independence to the nationalities which had lost it during the war. (3) Nationalities not previously enjoying independence to have the right to decide by plebiscite whether they would be united to other states or acquire independence. (4) Safeguarding of the rights of minorities in territories inhabited by several nationalities. (5) No war-indemnities, but war-requisitions to be returned. (6) Colonial questions to be decided on the same principles. The Russians also condemned everything in the nature of an economic war. On Christmas Day, Count Czernin (Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister) replied to these proposals, on behalf of the four allied Central States. The Foreign Minister said that the Central Powers desired "an immediate general peace without forcible acquisitions of territory and without war-indemnities". Count Czernin then replied point by point to the Russian suggestions, having first stipulated, however, that the Central Powers could not bind themselves formally to the Russian principles until Russia's allies did the same. He accepted points (1) and (2), and in regard to the latter said: "It is not the intention of the allies to rob of its independence any of the nations which in the course of this war have lost their independence." He refused (3), saying that these questions were not international problems, but were affairs between each State and its own people. He accepted (4). In regard to (5) he suggested that "each Power should only have to indemnify for the expenditure for its nationals who have become prisoners of war, and for damage done in its own territory by illegal acts against civilians of hostile nationality." In respect of (6) he said that Germany demanded the return of her colonies, and that plebiscites were impracticable under colonial conditions.

Such were the preliminary suggestions for peace terms set forth by the two sides respectively, and it will be noticed that the two statements were not entirely at variance, though the rejection of the third Russian item by the Central Powers constituted a far-reaching difference of opinion, both ideally and territorially. Nevertheless, the scheme put forward was in accord with the ideas of the German moderates and the Austrian Government, not with the plans of the Pan-Germans and the Bulgarian chauvinists. It should be remembered, however, that Count Czernin's speech was essentially an offer to the Entente as a whole, and, as was subsequently proved, Russia acting alone was unable to obtain nearly such a favourable offer.

At the suggestion of the Russian delegation it was agreed that the conference should be adjourned for ten days in order to give the other belligerent Powers an opportunity to declare their willingness to enter the conference and join in the negotiations for peace on the basis of the general principles outlined in Count Czernin's speech. To the chagrin of both sides at Brest-Litovsk, the British, French, and Italian Governments made no response to this offer. In taking this course of action, there is no doubt that the Western Governments had the support of the majorities of their respective peoples. It was, indeed, urged by those minorities whose support of the war had always been dubious that Count Czernin's speech was sufficiently reasonable to afford at least a basis for discussion, and in particular that the Central Powers appeared to be willing to restore the independence and territorial integrity of Belgium. On the other hand, it was clear that even if the Central Powers were really willing to restore Belgium, Serbia,¹ Montenegro, Rumania, and presumably also Luxemburg, yet they made no mention of that compensation to Belgium which was obviously required by justice, and they flatly refused to give any consideration to the French claims in regard to Alsace-Lorraine, or to the Italian claims in respect of the Trentino; moreover, the demand that all the German colonies should be restored was certain to meet with strong opposition in the British Dominions, if not in Great Britain. Thus the ten days passed, and the Western Governments did not waver from their decision to hold aloof from the negotiations.

The interval of ten days having elapsed (on January 4) a public joint declaration was made by the Central States that since the Western Powers, through their silence, had rejected the programme of peace on the general principles set forth on Christmas Day, they (the Central States) were not bound by those principles. And the Vienna *Fremdenblatt* (the organ of the Foreign Office) declared that the Western Powers would henceforth bear exclusive responsibility for the continuance of the war. After this declaration the situation, as was only to be

¹ It is hardly credible that the Central Powers can have intended to restore that part of Serbian Macedonia which Bulgaria claimed.

expected, developed very unfavourably for Russia. And the position of the delegates from Petrograd was undermined from another quarter by the arrival at Brest-Litovsk of a deputation from Kieff, claiming to represent Ukrainia, which was now proclaimed to be a sovereign and independent State. At the preliminary meetings a certain M. Joffe acted as president of the Muscovite delegation, but on January 7 M. Trotsky, the Muscovite Foreign Minister, arrived at Brest-Litovsk. M. Trotsky began by demanding that the conference should be removed to Stockholm (possibly thinking that such a change of location might even yet induce the Western Powers to participate), but this request was refused by the Austro-German delegation. M. Trotsky did not in any way sue for peace, but demanded fair terms in spirited language, and declared that if Russia were treated unjustly he would appeal to the working classes of Central Europe to restrain their Governments from crushing the new Russian democracy.

On January 11 and 12 long discussions took place between committees of the Russian, German, and Austro-Hungarian delegations, including Herr von Kühlmann (German Foreign Minister), M. Trotsky, and General Hoffmann (representing the German Army), on the question of the self-determination of the border nationalities. M. Trotsky said that Russia made no claim to her former frontiers, which had violated every principle of nationality and had been established by force only, but he claimed that the border territories ought to be evacuated by the German troops before any act of self-determination was carried out. Since German troops occupied no part of Finland and only a small part of Ukrainia at this time, little difference of opinion arose in theory in respect of the independence of these two countries, though it should be noted that in practice Muscovite Bolshevik troops were interfering in both these provinces of the former Russian Empire. On the other hand, an acute controversy occurred about Poland, Courland, Lithuania, the town of Riga, and the islands of the Riga Gulf, all these regions being in German occupation. Kühlmann contended that the diets and councils which had been established in the various territories, with the sanction of the German Government, had already performed acts of self-determination, and had separated themselves from Russia. He explained that the willingness of the German authorities to "evacuate Russia" meant that they would maintain no garrisons in the country which would constitute the Russian State after the declaration of peace, not that German troops would necessarily depart from all the territories which composed the Russian Empire before the war. Trotsky replied that he did not admit that the existing diets were competent to carry out self-determination; these bodies might no doubt legitimately claim to play a part in making the arrangements for holding plebiscites to decide the destinies of the countries, but such plebiscites ought, he

again averred, to be thoroughly democratic in character and should be carried out after the German forces had left the territories. General Hoffmann then intervened, and made a crude and offensive speech. He took exception to the tone of the Russian speeches. He said that the Russians spoke as though they were victorious, and he bluntly reminded them that the reverse was the case. In answer to the Bolshevik talk about democracy, he retorted—and this not without truth—that the Bolsheviks did not apply it in their own country. They terrorised those who differed from them, they were invading Ukraina, and in December they had dispersed with machine-guns a White Russian congress at Minsk which was about to declare the self-determination of the White Russian people. Hoffmann declared further that it was impracticable to evacuate Lithuania and the Baltic lands immediately, since these territories possessed at present nothing of the machinery of administration.

The unilateral character of the German proposals needs no emphasis. In theory the western border States of Russia were to have the right of self-determination; no such right was to be given to the eastern border States of the Central Empires. Courland, Lithuania, and Russian Poland, were to be theoretically free to decide their own destinies. There was no thought of conferring the same liberty of decision upon Posen, Galicia, Bukovina, or Transylvania. And even so, the ex-Russian territories were not to give their decision under impartial auspices, but whilst under German occupation and under administrations which were at least partly German. In the case of the town of Riga, whose traditions had always been German, it is probable that the new diet really did represent the sentiments of the people; but in all the other territories¹ the conditions of the so-called self-determination were such as every democrat must regard as merely farcical. It is somewhat notable that it does not seem to have occurred to the Russian delegation to propose that the acts of self-determination should be carried out under neutral auspices and guarantees.

An absolute deadlock was thus reached on this important question of the border States. The German delegation continued to maintain their point of view, which they had, in fact, first set forth in writing before the end of the above-mentioned ten days' interval, and Trotsky on his side refused to yield. The committee adjourned on the evening of January 14, without reaching any compromise.

In the meantime rapid progress was made in the separate negotiations between Ukraina and the Central Powers, and on January 21 it was announced that an agreement on the principles of a peace treaty between the parties concerned had been reached. The general terms of this agreement were stated to be as follows:—

¹The establishment of the new States is described in the Foreign History, Chapter III.

The state of war is to be declared at an end. The resolution of both parties to live henceforth in peace is to be ratified.

The troops of both parties are to be withdrawn at the conclusion of peace.

Both parties agree that arrangements shall be made in the treaty of peace for the immediate resumption of lawful economic intercourse.

Diplomatic and consular relations are to be resumed as speedily as possible.

The conclusion of this provisional agreement with the Ukrainian Republic had the effect of further exasperating the unfortunate Muscovite delegates. The treaty involved the establishment of the independence of a territory which was not merely a part of the former Russian Empire, but was a part of Russia in the strict sense of that word, and this development therefore destroyed all immediate prospect of realising the legitimate hopes of national unity which the Muscovites entertained. Moreover, the position of the Petrograd Government in the negotiations with the Central Powers necessarily became, in the new circumstances, even weaker than it had previously been. The Muscovites urged that no treaty signed by the Ukrainian Government could be regarded as valid until it had been ratified by a federal Government of all Russia, but the Austro-German delegates insisted upon recognising *Ukrainia* as a sovereign independent State. M. Trotsky was not permitted to interfere and at 2 A.M. on February 9 peace was signed at Brest-Litovsk by the plenipotentiaries of the Central Powers and the Ukrainian Republic. The terms of the agreement were favourable to the new State, and it was seemingly the intention of the German and Austro-Hungarian Governments to give *Ukrainia* a better and more independent standing than they proposed to allow any of the other border countries.¹ The reader may be reminded that this was the first peace-treaty to be signed by any of the belligerents in the great war.

The peace with *Ukrainia* and the German refusal to adopt Trotsky's proposals for the self-determination of the other border countries brought the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk to an abrupt termination. Trotsky issued a proclamation stating that he would not sign a treaty the terms of which he believed to be unjust, but that, at the same time, the Russian people would not wage war against the German and Austrian soldiers, "who were workmen and peasants like themselves," and that the war was therefore at an end. A general demobilisation of the Russian Armies upon all the fronts was immediately ordered, and thus the conference at Brest-Litovsk came to a singular end.

THE RENEWAL OF THE GERMAN OPERATIONS IN RUSSIA.

The last sitting of the delegates at Brest-Litovsk, at which both Kühlmann and Trotsky were present, took place on

¹ Further reference to this peace is made in the Foreign History, Chapter III.

February 10. Kühlmann refused to accept the informal termination of hostilities which Trotsky had announced, and demanded definite declarations of terms from the Russians, including a statement as to where they supposed the Russian frontiers now ran. Kühlmann further declared that if the armistice did not end in a formal treaty of peace, the state of war would necessarily revive.

In their dismay and chagrin at the separate peace concluded by Ukraina, the Bolsheviks were unable to make up their minds to sign a definite treaty embodying the humiliating terms which their enemies were demanding, but by taking this course of action they only exposed themselves to further mortification. At noon on February 18 the German authorities reopened hostilities on what they now described as the "Great Russian Front." In the meantime, Muscovite forces had been invading Ukraina in order to suppress the independence which that province had claimed, and the invaders had quickly seized the capital, Kieff. The Ukrainian Government were thus forced to flee, and there seems little doubt that, if no German intervention had occurred, the Muscovites, aided by the Bolshevik minority in Ukraina, would have succeeded in extinguishing the separate existence of the South Russian State. And their action in this crisis sheds a cynical light upon their professed solicitude for the rights of small nations to decide their own destinies. The Ukrainian Ministry appealed to Germany for assistance, however, and consequently German forces were set in motion from the direction of Kovel on February 18, and these troops advanced rapidly into the Ukrainian territory.

The German forces, meeting with little or no serious resistance, marched eastwards with extreme rapidity. Dünaburg was seized in the first move, and Minsk fell on February 21. On February 21 also, the Southern Army, under the command of von Linsingen, established a junction with the defeated Ukrainian Army at Novogradvolynsk, a town situated 120 miles west of Kieff. The menace of this new invasion had the desired effect in Petrograd. M. Lenin, a personage with a keener sense for disagreeable realities than his fanatical Foreign Minister, Trotsky, possessed, asserted his authority; and on February 19 the Muscovite Government issued an announcement which, whilst complaining that hostilities had been recommenced without the seven days' notice required by the terms of the armistice,¹ expressed the willingness of the Petrograd Government to sign a peace upon the conditions which had been dictated by the delegations of the quadruple Alliance at Brest-Litovsk. The surrender was not immediately accepted by the Germans. The Muscovite announcement was issued through the medium of

¹ It is debatable how far this complaint was justified. No formal notice seems to have been given by the Germans, but it is true that Kühlmann warned the Russians on February 10 that the termination of the negotiations without the signing of a definite treaty would cause the reopening of hostilities.

wireless telegraphy, and General Hoffmann replied that since this message necessarily lacked the original signatures it could not be regarded as an official document, and he therefore requested that an authentication in writing should be sent to Dünaburg. The German troops continued in the meantime to advance by forced marches, especially on the extreme wings, in the Baltic Provinces and in Ukraina. Regiments crossed over the frozen strait between Moon Island and Esthonia, and advanced both inland and along the coast in the direction of Reval. The Germans encountered no serious opposition at any point. Since November most of the Russian soldiers had deserted from the Front, and even those who still remained had no desire to fight. Between March and November, 1917, a process of disintegration was at work in the Russian Army, and after a few weeks of the Bolshevik regime that once mighty Army had, as an Army, literally ceased to exist. The troops degenerated into a demoralised and anarchic rabble. The only effective armed force then possessed by Muscovy consisted of the bands of revolutionaries known as "Red Guards." These bands were new formations, and the members of them were workmen and peasants who really possessed some enthusiasm for the revolutionary principles, and were not merely degraded egotists, as were the majority of the ex-soldiers. The Red Guards were, however, weak numerically, and for the most part they were engaged in fighting in Ukraina, against the Cossacks, and against the non-Bolshevik elements in Muscovy, not against the Germans. The Russian soldiers, in fleeing into the interior, abandoned much of their war-material and most of their guns, and thus immense quantities of booty fell into the hands of the Germans. The German reports claimed that over 1,300 guns were taken in the first three days, and in the circumstances of the Russian panic there is nothing improbable in this figure.

The Russian authorities dispatched a special courier to Dünaburg, bearing a formal written surrender, but the Germans seemed determined, now that the armistice had been broken, to penetrate much further into Russia. The advance can scarcely be said to have borne the character of a warlike operation. The German troops merely occupied the territory, and owing to the anarchy which had prevailed, they were welcomed in many places by the inhabitants, especially in Esthonia and Livonia. The middle and upper classes, who were in imminent danger of losing their property and even their lives at the hands of the thieving and murdering bands of deserters, were glad to see the re-establishment of any kind of law and order, even by the dictates of foreign generals. The Germans did not attempt to gather in any considerable number of prisoners. As the invaders came up with the fugitives, they merely disarmed them, and then turned them loose again.

On February 21 the German Government issued a statement of the terms upon which they would accept the surrender

of the Russians. The terms were much more severe than those which had been discussed at Brest-Litovsk, even than those which were proposed after the refusal of the other Powers to participate in the negotiations had become apparent. The terms included eleven clauses, as follows:—

1. Germany and Russia to declare the state of war to end.

2. Regions which are west of a line, as indicated at Brest-Litovsk to the Russian delegation, and which formerly belonged to the Russian State are no longer under the territorial protection of Russia. In the region of Dvinsk (Dünaburg) this line shall be advanced to the eastern frontier of Courland. The former attachment of these regions to the Russian State shall in no case involve for them an obligation towards Russia. Russia renounces every claim to intervene in the internal affairs of those regions. Germany and Austria-Hungary have the intention to define the further fate of these regions in agreement with their populations.

Germany is ready, after the completion of the Russian demobilisation, to evacuate regions which are east of the above-named line, so far as it is not stated otherwise in Article (3).

3. Livonia and Esthonia must be immediately cleared of Russian troops and Red Guards, and will be occupied by German police until the date when the constitution of the respective countries will guarantee their social security and political order. All inhabitants who were arrested for political reasons must be released immediately.

4. Russia will conclude peace with Ukrainia. Both Finland and Ukrainia to be evacuated by Russian troops and Red Guards.

5. Russia will do all in her power to secure for Turkey the due return of its eastern Anatolian frontiers. Russia recognises the annulment of the Turkish capitulations.

6. Complete demobilisation of the Russian Army, inclusive of detachments lately formed by the Bolshevik Government, must take place immediately.

7. Russian warships in the Black Sea, Baltic Sea, and Arctic Ocean must be sent into Russian ports immediately, and either be kept therein till the conclusion of a general peace, or be disarmed. Warships of the Entente which are in the sphere of the Russian authorities must be regarded as Russian ships. Merchant navigation in the Black Sea and Baltic to be renewed. The blockade of the Arctic Ocean to remain in force till the conclusion of a general peace.

8. The Russo-German commercial treaty of 1904 comes into force, as stated in Article VII, Clause 2, of the Peace Treaty with Ukrainia. The free untariffed export of ores to be guaranteed.

9. Legal-political relations to be re-established and duly regulated according to German proposals, and there must be indemnification, with expenses, for prisoners of war, according to the Russian proposals.

10. The Russian Government promises to cease propaganda and agitation against the Central States.

11. The above-mentioned conditions must be accepted within forty-eight hours. Russian plenipotentiaries must start immediately for Brest-Litovsk and sign the peace treaty there within three days, and the treaty must be ratified within two weeks.

The Muscovite Government expressed their willingness to accept these terms, and on February 24 the following wireless message, signed by Lenin and Trotsky, was sent to Berlin :—

“According to the decision taken by the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets of Workmen’s, Soldiers’, and Peasants’ delegates at 4.30 A.M. on February 24, the Council of People’s Commissioners has decided to accept the peace conditions offered by the German Government and to send a delegation to Brest-Litovsk.”

The delegates departed from Petrograd immediately, but the German armies continued to advance in the border territories and even in regions which were to remain part of the Russian republic. Pernaú and Dorpat were occupied on the 24th, and the great port of Reval and also Pskoff fell into the hands of the invaders on the following day. In Ukraina von Linsingen’s advanced troops reached Jitomir (the capital of Volhynia) on February 24, and five days later Homel and Kieff were seized. The Treaty of Peace was signed on March 3, and thereupon the advance in Muscovite territory ceased. In the south, however, the extension of the German occupation continued, and Austro-Hungarian forces also co-operated in these operations. German troops reached Odessa on March 13.

The peace treaty as finally signed at Brest-Litovsk embodied the terms contained in the German statement of February 21, the only important addition being a clause which specified that “the districts of Ardahan, Kars, and Batum shall without delay be evacuated by Russian troops. Russia shall not interfere in the reorganisation of the Constitutional and International conditions of these districts, but shall leave it to the population of these districts to carry out the reorganisation in agreement with the neighbouring States, particularly Turkey.” It will be remembered that these three districts of Armenia were ceded to Russia by the Berlin Treaty of 1878. The text of the new treaty also defined more closely the frontiers of Esthonia and Livonia. “The eastern frontier of Esthonia follows in general the line of the Narva river. The eastern frontier of Livonia runs in general through Lake Peipus and Lake Pskoff to the south-west corner of the latter, and then over Lake Luban in the direction of Lievenhof on the Dvina.” This clause enlarged the territory of Livonia, the old boundary of the province having struck the Dvina about 30 miles nearer its mouth. The treaty was signed by the following plenipotentiaries : *Germany*—Herr von Kühlmann, Herr von Rosenberg, General Hoffmann, and Captain Horn (the latter representing the Navy). *Austria-*

Hungary—Count Czernin, M. Meroy, and Field-Marshal Csicsics. *Bulgaria*—M. Tontcheff, Colonel Gantcheff, and M. Anasassoff. *Turkey*—Hakki Pasha and General Zekki Pasha. *Russia*—M. Sokolnikoff, M. Karakhan, M. Tchitcherin, and M. Petrovsky.

An essential part of the treaty was the map which was appended to it. This map was issued officially to the German newspapers, and it was stated authoritatively that it was an integral part of the agreement concluded between the Powers at Brest-Litovsk. The map showed the "agreed line," which was constantly referred to during the negotiations. The territories west of this line, Courland, Lithuania, and Poland, were to be placed in an intimate sense under German or Austro-German protection. In the north this "agreed line," ran first between the islands of Dagö and Worms, and between Moon Island and the Esthonian mainland, southward, through the Gulf of Riga, to a point on the Livonian coast just north-east of the mouth of the Livonian Aa, whence it curved south-east to Oger, just above Uexküll on the Dvina; after this the line followed the course alike of the Dvina and the Courland boundary as far as the latter's extreme easterly point beyond Dvinsk, whence it once more descended in a south-westerly direction (leaving Drisviaty, Vidzy, and Tveretch to the east, and Svetsiany to the west) until it cut the Vilna-Smorgon railway a little to the west of Slobodka. Still continuing south-west, the line passed west of Oshmiany, down the stream of the Gavia to the latter's confluence with the Niemen, whose course the line also followed to a point just above Mosty, where it turned south-east up the course of the Selvianka as far as Roshany, which was left on the east side. The line then passed away again to the south-west, until it struck the Ukrainian frontier at Prushany.

It will be seen from this description that the border territories renounced by Russia fell into two distinct categories. Finland, Esthonia, Livonia, and Ukraina were deemed to be independent States, whereas the territories west of the "agreed line," were clearly intended to have a close connexion, of one sort or another, with the Central European Alliance. This point was made clear in the map. But, on the other hand, the distinction between the two categories of States was much more evident in theory than in practice; for, in fact, German influence and German troops were active in the four more easterly States. The German line of occupation ran 100 miles and in parts much more to the east of the "agreed line." The occupied territory lying east of the agreed line and between the south-eastern border of Livonia and the northern frontier of Ukraina was to remain part of the Muscovite Republic, and this region, which included Pskoff, Minsk, Homel, and other considerable towns, was to be duly evacuated by the Germans.

It will be seen that the Russian territorial losses were on the

largest scale. The aggregate area¹ of the border States was about 430,000 square miles, and the aggregate population was about fifty-five millions. The losses were ruinous. It is not too much to say that the Russian State had ceased to exist. The cession of some of the territories was not, indeed, vital; Finland, the Baltic provinces, Poland, and even Lithuania could be cut off without any real destruction of Russian unity, for these had never been more than alien appanages of Russia; but the secession of Ukraina destroyed the Russian State. The Ukrainians were Russians, and their province was geographically, economically, and in other respects an essential part of the Russian land. The greater fragment of the country, which still acknowledged the authority of the Government in Petrograd, might arrogate to itself the name of Russia, but it was as inaccurate to call it Russia as it would have been to describe Mediæval Castile as "Spain". The Bolshevik State which survived the Peace of Brest-Litovsk was not Russia; it constituted merely a strange reappearance of what our forefathers used to call Muscovy.

A HINTERLAND OF CENTRAL EUROPE.

The strategic effects of the conclusion of peace in Eastern Europe were, of course, of transcendent importance. The fundamental character of the war was altogether altered. For three years and more Central Europe had been hemmed in by the massive forces of Eastern Europe and Western Europe, the latter being strengthened by the maritime supremacy and colonial power which appertained to it. And in the first twelve months the eastern flank of Central Europe had been actually crushed inwards, and for many months the peoples in the heart of the continent were in peril of suffocation. And even the victories and advances of the Warsaw and Bukarest campaigns did no more than modify slightly these essential conditions of the war. The dull pressure continued. But if Germany could hold out long enough to develop the new situation, the Russian peace would, obviously and necessarily, relieve the suffocation and let in air. The work of the prolonged British blockade of Germany would be largely undone. Germany was no longer compelled to face the severe task of a war on two great fronts.

Hitherto the war had appeared as an unequal contest between a relatively small, though efficient, belligerent group, and two other colossal belligerents, lying east and west, each of whom represented a large fraction of the habitable globe. But the conflict had now taken on quite a different character. Territorially, the smaller belligerent group had swollen to much greater dimensions (for the new Austro-German protectorates in the East were about equal in area to the two combined

¹ A large part of the area (about 126,000 square miles) is, however, accounted for by sparsely populated Finland.

Central Empires), and with the disappearance of the Eastern belligerent the disparity in numbers, though still existing, was much reduced. And in the new position, the importance of the new Austro-German protectorates needs to be emphasised ; for their natural resources, their woman-power, and (at least in non-combatant capacities) their man-power were, in fact if not always in name, almost wholly under the control of Berlin. And their potential resources were great.

And the result of this enlargement of the hostile coalition was that on the continent of Europe the Entente were overshadowed. Central Europe was now the main mass of Europe. The Eastern frontiers of the new protectorates were also the Eastern frontiers of civilised and ordered Europe : beyond them was only chaos. Now the distance from the Atlantic to the French Front was 350 miles. The distance from the French Front to Vilna was 1,000 miles, to Odessa, 1,300 miles, to Reval, about 1,300 miles, and to Kharkoff nearly 1,500 miles. The area of France, Italy, Portugal, and Greece was 390,000 square miles, and even this small area had been somewhat reduced by the enemy's invasions. The combined population of those four belligerents was about 85,000,000. The area of neutral Europe (Spain and the five Teutonic neutrals) was 535,000 square miles, and the neutral population was 42,000,000. The area of the enlarged Central Europe (excluding the whole of the Ottoman Empire) was about 1,065,000 square miles, and its population was about 203,000,000.

And the change in the strategic position of Central Europe was even more important than the increase of magnitude. Central Europe no longer had two fronts, it had a front and a back. The great monarchies faced westwards, towards the Atlantic and the highway out to the extra-European world. But they were cut off from the Atlantic, firstly by the weaker Western States, and secondly by the stupendous strength of the "Anglo-Saxon" world, mobilised to operate upon the continent of Europe. And it was owing to this aspect of the situation that the British blockade continued to have value, for the gate leading outwards to the Americas, to Africa, to the Orient, and to Australasia remained closed. Certain German publicists endeavoured to represent the war as an attempt on the part of the "Anglo-Saxon" world to impose its will upon Europe, whilst Germany was pictured as championing the freedom of Europe against such external interference. In politics and morals, the claim was of course mere nonsense, for the German and Magyar races were actually a minority in the enlarged Central Europe, and not many millions of the other races were willing partners in the alliance. But in strategy, the claim was not wholly untrue ; it was, in fact, an exaggeration rather than an untruth. The war had really taken on the character of a struggle, in the main, between the English-speaking world and a force which did in practice control the greater part of the European continent.

And in addition to the enlargement of Central Europe and the changed relationship which it now bore to its "Front," there was another change which was brought about by the Russian collapse. Central Europe now had a back; and it backed upon a territory so vast that it might still be regarded as almost a separate world in itself. The area of what had been the Russian Empire, even after the great Western Provinces had been cut off and had become affiliated to Central Europe, was still no less than 8,000,000 square miles, and its population was still 130,000,000. This was a world in chaos, but yet was a world with such potential resources as could hardly fail to render it of importance to any belligerents who could establish communication with it. The Allies could only come at it by the Arctic route or through the remote port of Vladivostok. It is not surprising that most statesmen in Western Europe felt that a satisfactory settlement of the Belgian and French questions was by no means the only demand which the Entente would have to make in any possible peace negotiations. For this vast Euro-Asiatic region had become in very truth a mere Hinterland of Central Europe.

THE WAR AT SEA.

During the first three months of the year the character of the war at sea underwent no fundamental modification. The German Navy continued to avoid surface warfare, and in view of its notorious inferiority, which had of course been accentuated by the intervention of the United States in the previous year, the German admirals could not reasonably have acted otherwise. The command of the surface of the sea, which the Entente had always held so completely, continued unchallenged; and in surface warfare, therefore, the monotony of the Entente blockade of the German and Austro-Hungarian coasts was broken only by the most insignificant incidents. The submarine campaign attracted much greater attention. The menacing character of the destruction caused by the German submarines in the spring of the previous year had been understood by all, and the statistics of the mercantile losses had been closely watched by the British public. But towards the end of 1917 the weekly figures relating to losses became consistently smaller, and it became apparent that whilst the depredations of the undersea vessels could not be wholly prevented, they were, nevertheless, being reduced and checked by the new measures and devices of the Allied navies.

The first incident to be recorded is the sudden reappearance of the German cruisers *Goeben* and *Breslau* whose exploits were famous at the beginning of the war, when they escaped from Messina to the Dardanelles, in spite of the presence in the Mediterranean of large French and British fleets. On the morning of January 20 the *Goeben* and the *Breslau*,

accompanied by a squadron of Turkish destroyers, carried out a daring sortie from the Dardanelles. Early in the morning the British destroyer *Lizard* sighted the two well-known German cruisers making for the north of Imbros. The *Lizard* immediately gave the alarm, and was joined by the destroyer *Tigress*, but not before the *Goeben* had sunk two British monitors. Finding themselves discovered the Germans made back at full speed for the mouth of the straits. In her flight the *Breslau* ran into a minefield and quickly sank. The *Goeben* was more fortunate. She struck a mine, but succeeded in making her way up to the Narrows, where she was beached close to Nagara Point. The two British destroyers engaged the four Turkish destroyers which issued forth, and aircraft came into action on both sides. About a week later, after a British submarine which attempted to attack the *Goeben* had been sunk, the Germans and Turks succeeded in refloating the cruiser, and she returned to Constantinople. The *Breslau*, it will be remembered, was only a small cruiser, her tonnage being 4,478. The *Goeben*, on the other hand, was a *Dreadnought* battle-cruiser of the latest type with a tonnage of 22,625. It may be mentioned that the Turks had renamed the *Goeben* with the title *Sultan Selim*, and called the *Breslau* by the new name *Midillu*. The British rescued 172 survivors of the *Breslau*. Of the crews of the sunken monitors nearly 200 were killed or drowned.

Two hospital ships were unfortunately sunk in the Bristol Channel early in the year. On January 4 the hospital ship *Rewa*, which was on her way home from Gibraltar, was sunk in the channel, though nearly all the crew and all the patients on board were saved. It was believed that the vessel was torpedoed by a submarine, though the German Government denied this, and alleged that she must have run upon a mine. At 4 A.M. on February 26, the *Glenart Castle*, outward bound, was also sunk in the Bristol Channel. She carried no patients, but there were nearly 200 persons on board, and of these only twenty-nine were saved. On this occasion sworn statements were made by survivors that the ship was torpedoed by a submarine. The persons drowned included seven R.A.M.C. officers and eight female nurses.

On March 10 submarines made an attack upon a third hospital ship, the *Guildford Castle*, at the entrance to the Bristol Channel, but on this occasion the attack was happily unsuccessful.

On February 5 the Anchor liner *Tuscania*, a vessel of about 14,000 tons, was torpedoed off the coast of Ireland, whilst she was transporting American troops. Over 2,000 persons were on board at the time, but only about 200 were drowned.

Early in the morning of February 15 a flotilla of German destroyers made a raid into the Straits of Dover, and sunk eight small British patrol boats, which had been pursuing a submarine.

On March 1 the auxiliary cruiser *Calgarian*, a vessel of over 17,000 tons, which had formerly been one of the largest ships of the Allan line, was torpedoed and sunk off the coast of Ireland. The crew numbered over 600, but only two officers and forty-six men were drowned.

During the early part of the year the British Government continued to publish weekly figures relating to the losses incurred through the depredations of the submarines, the statistics being issued at first in the same form as those which were published in the previous year (see A.R., 1917).

These statistics may be summarised as shown in the following table:—

| Month. | Arrivals at United Kingdom Ports. | Sailings from United Kingdom Ports. | Sunk. Over 1,600 Tons. | Sunk. Under 1,600 Tons. | Unsuccessfully Attacked by Sub- marines. |
|---------------|---|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Jan. (4 wks.) | 9,052 | 9,108 | 30 | 14 | 31 |
| Feb. (4 wks.) | 9,012 | 9,274 | 49 | 19 | 33 |
| Mar. (4 wks.) | 9,031 | 9,246 | 46 | 25 | 54 |

The reduction in the losses which this table shows will be realised when the reader is reminded that in the one month of April, 1917, 144 British ships of over 1,600 tons and 39 ships of under 1,600 tons were sunk by submarines or mines. The figures in the columns relating to arrivals and departures include ships of all nationalities, but the statistics of losses and of vessels unsuccessfully attacked refer to British ships only.

AERIAL WARFARE.

The number of aeroplanes employed by both sides on the Western Front continued to increase, and the intensity of the aerial warfare was thus enhanced. Nothing, indeed, was more striking in the development of tactics during the war than the extraordinarily rapid growth in importance of the respective Flying Corps. At the beginning of the war the aerial arm was regarded as a casual and perfunctory auxiliary, but after three years the aeroplanes had become an essential and most important part of the army. Airships, which were necessarily large targets, were scarcely ever used in ordinary land warfare, as they were much too vulnerable, but they were employed at sea, and were also sent on long-distance nocturnal raids. The aeroplanes used on the battle-fronts were almost exclusively biplanes, and monoplanes (machines which possessed much less stability) were rarely seen. Experiments were made with triplanes, but these machines were not utilised in large numbers.

The British and French Flying Corps carried out constant raids against the towns of Western Germany, one of the most

successful of these raids being an attack upon Karlsruhe by the British on January 14. The main railway station was heavily bombed, and many buildings were set on fire.

The German raids on England were less serious, during these three months, than they had been in the previous year, the defences of London and other parts having been much improved. Squadrons of aeroplanes attacked London on the night of January 28, and also on the following night. The former raid caused some damage, and about fifty persons were killed, and more than thrice that number were injured. On the second occasion the raiders were driven away from the capital by gunfire, but they dropped bombs in Essex and Kent, and thus killed a few civilians. On the night of February 16 and on the following night, renewed attacks were made upon London, but little damage was done. On February 17 one German machine was brought down into the sea near Dover, which town was also attacked. In a raid on the night of March 7, two aeroplanes reached London and did some material damage and killed about twenty persons. In the evening of March 12, a single Zeppelin airship crossed the Yorkshire coast, and while sailing at a great altitude, the vessel dropped four bombs on Hartlepool. Eight persons were killed and twenty-two were injured.

CHAPTER II.

THE LAST GERMAN OFFENSIVE.

It has been explained in the last chapter that the defection of Russia had left the great new combination which was called Central Europe in a position of domination on the Continent. And it has been further explained that, as a result of this, the war had taken on the character of a struggle mainly between the so-called Anglo-Saxon world and the new enlarged Central Europe. If a struggle of this character had taken place at an earlier stage of the war or, alternatively, after Central Europe had had a few years to recuperate, there would have been no very great inequality between the two sides. For as already explained, the area, population, and resources now under the control of Berlin were very large. In the existing circumstances, however, a great inequality did exist. For Central Europe had been exhausted in all respects by nearly four years of war. On the other hand, the enormous population and resources of the United States were almost untouched, and even those of the British Empire were not in the same state of depletion as existed in Central Europe. And of course the core of Central Europe, Germany, had itself suffered in the most severe manner, both from the land war and from the naval blockade. Thus it comes about that a mere recital of the population and

resources of the countries of Central Europe, without this important qualification, which we have now to emphasise, gives a false picture of the relative capacities of the two belligerent groups.

The other advantage obtained by the Central Powers through the defection of Russia was also one which could have no immediate effect. We refer to the advantage of direct access to the whole of the Russian Empire and of indirect access to many of the other countries of Asia. European Russia, even including the territories occupied by German and Austro-Hungarian troops, was now reduced to such a condition of chaos and extreme poverty that the new power of communication with that great area was in reality of very little profit to Germany, and had but little effect in mitigating the results of the blockade. It is true that this great area which we have described as a hinterland of Central Europe, would, under German domination, have proved an extremely valuable asset to the Central Powers if they had been granted a respite of a few years in which to organise the resources and government of that territory. But so far as the year 1918 was concerned the opening of communication with the East could not be expected to have any very great influence upon the course of events.

The Central Powers were therefore faced with a problem which in its largest aspect was twofold. The failure of the German submarine campaign had made it possible for the United States to bring to bear her enormous power upon the continent of Europe, and the time required to accomplish this was in practice far less than anybody in the Entente countries would have dared to hope at the beginning of 1917. If, therefore, the Germans were to obtain a decisive victory upon land it was necessary for them to strike within quite a limited space of time. On the other hand, from the point of view of the naval blockade, the lapse of time would necessarily now work to the advantage of Central Europe. The blockade had caused extreme privation in Germany and Austria-Hungary; and the populations concerned would be obliged to bear these privations for at least another year before any serious relief could be expected from the East. Hence from the strictly military point of view, the French, British, and Italian Armies were faced with the task of holding out until relief arrived from the United States; and, contrariwise, the Central Powers, on the economic side, were faced with the task of holding out until relief could be brought from enslaved Russia.

Hence it came about that the first great event of the year was the attempt of the German military authorities to overwhelm the French and British Armies before the American troops arrived in force. There was very little serious fighting in the West before the end of March. And it was not until March 21 that the great German blow was struck. It was announced at the end of January that the British Army had taken

over a further section of the line from the French and that the British front now extended to the South of St. Quentin, as far as the village of Barisis. This was the first extension of the British line which had taken place since December, 1916, when the French section of the line on the old Somme battlefield had been taken over. In view of subsequent events this announcement that the British had taken over the St. Quentin line was of peculiar interest. The new sector was 28 miles long, and the total length of the British front was 125 miles.

It was known many weeks before the German blow came that the General Staff were making elaborate preparations for an attack which should be by far the most terrible thing yet seen in the war. There was to be a great combination of all the forms of attack hitherto used. After, and even before, the treaty of Brest-Litovsk was signed, the Germans began to remove large masses of their Eastern Armies to the West, and after they had finally imposed their will upon Russia, 70 per cent. of the Eastern Army seems to have been transferred. The new offensive was under the supreme direction of von Hindenburg and von Ludendorff, but the actual tactical details appear to have been devised by General von Hutier who had distinguished himself in the capture of Riga in the previous year. Von Hutier had brought the German tacticians back to a belief in the power of an assault by enormous masses of men, the same method which they had adopted at the very beginning of the war, but which had subsequently been somewhat abandoned. And he also devised a combination of the artillery barrage, rifle-fire, flame-throwers, tanks, and various other new devices which was more perfect than anything heretofore seen.

It was against the British Army that the full force of the first blow fell. At dawn on Thursday, March 21, an intense bombardment was opened by the enemy along over 50 miles of the British front, from the river Scarpe to the neighbourhood of the Oise. The German strategists had succeeded in obtaining a considerable numerical superiority over the Fifth Army stationed to the west of St. Quentin, and partly on this account, and partly because the method of attack was both new and ingenious, the Germans broke clean through the British lines in this region at the first attempt. The preliminary bombardment, though short, was so intense that the defensive works in the advanced lines were completely destroyed, and the Fifth Army (commanded by General Sir H. Gough) was therefore compelled from the very first day to execute a rapid retreat. The first German report on the battle declared that 200 guns and 16,000 prisoners had been captured on March 21, and in view of the magnitude of the operations there was nothing improbable in these claims. The British Third Army, under General Sir J. Byng, stationed north of the Fifth Army, was obliged to fall back. During the next few days the German advance was extremely rapid, and indeed on Saturday the 23rd, on

the southern part of the front, the enemy succeeded in effecting a definite breach in the retreating British line, and for some hours the British troops actually lost contact with one another on this part of the front. West of St. Quentin the Germans effected an advance of no less than 15 miles in four days, and by the evening of the 25th the situation already appeared to be positively alarming. The entire British line from the Scarpe to La Fère—that is, to the Oise—was in full retreat, though on the extreme wings the German advance was considerably less than in the centre. It appeared from the German report that 25,000 prisoners and some 400 guns had been captured in the first two days, and in the next two days the British lost about another 250 guns, though owing to the prompt orders for a rapid retreat the number of prisoners lost on the third and fourth days was smaller. It will be noticed that the region of the German advance was almost coincident with that part of the line which von Hindenburg had deemed it expedient to withdraw early in the spring of 1917. The immediate objectives of the German centre were the towns of Bapaume and Peronne. The towns of Peronne and Ham were captured on the evening of the 23rd, and Bapaume fell on the evening of the 24th. The Germans stated that the number of prisoners captured up to the morning of the 25th was over 45,000. On Monday, March 25, both the British and the French threw large reserves into the battle, but these were at present unable to check the German advance, and on the evening of the 26th the Germans had in places actually crossed the old line which they occupied before the great battle of the Somme in 1916.

At the end of the first week of the offensive the enemy had made an advance of no less than 35 miles, and before that time it had become evident that the German staff were aiming what they hoped would be a decisive blow at Amiens. And it can scarcely be doubted that the loss of that town by the Allies would have altered fundamentally and very gravely the general strategic situation in France. With Amiens lost it would have been a matter of extreme difficulty for the British and French armies to have maintained contact with one another, and hence the issue which was fought out here during the last days of March was no less a one than this: whether the opposing armies should have positions of approximately equal strategic strength, or whether a definite German predominance should be established on the Western Front. In the latter eventuality the British Army itself would undoubtedly have been in a position of dire peril, and even though the situation might have been eventually retrieved by the appearance of the American Army, yet at the very best the difficulty of the task before that army would have been enormously enhanced. It is clear indeed from a study of the topographical details that from the strategic, though of course not from the moral, point of view the loss of Amiens would have been even more serious than the loss of

Paris. For the evacuation of the French capital would not necessarily have involved any severance of the British and French Armies, although no doubt the Allied line would have been dangerously extended.

By March 27 the German centre was about 10 miles beyond the positions the enemy occupied before the great battle of the Somme. The Germans had taken Albert, Chaulnes, and Roye, and the spearhead of the German Army was now less than 15 miles from Amiens. On the wings, the advance, though great, had not been quite so alarming, and both to the north and south the enemy had not quite reached their positions in the old battle, nor had they at present crossed the Oise. On the evening of the 27th the Germans captured the important railway junction of Montdidier lying between Amiens and Compiègne. The capture of Montdidier at the end of the seventh day may be taken as the climax of the hostile offensive, for by the seizure of this town the Germans were able to dominate with their guns the railway from Amiens *via* St. Just to Paris and thus seriously to incommode the communication between the Allied Armies. And indeed with Montdidier lost, it is scarcely too much to say that the fall of Amiens appeared to be almost imminent.

Whilst this advance was taking place the Germans opened a sensational but not very damaging bombardment of Paris with an entirely new type of gun. It appeared that this gun was located at a point several miles behind the German advanced lines and at a distance of no less than 75 miles from the capital. On the night of the 22nd the Parisians were aroused by the sirens which usually heralded air-raids, and from then to the morning of the next day the new type of shells fell upon the metropolis, though at considerable intervals. From the fragments of the shells which were recovered it appeared that the calibre of the gun was 9·5 inches and the shells seemed to have been unusually thick-walled in proportion to their size, the thickness of the walls being nearly 2 inches. It was calculated by the artillery experts that the initial velocity of the shells, in order to attain this range, must have been over 5,000 feet per second, and it seems that the extreme altitude attained must have been about 20 miles. The reader will notice that this range was nearly three times greater than the greatest hitherto attained; but although the feat was undoubtedly a remarkable one from the mechanical point of view, the damage done by these occasional small shells was of course inconsiderable.

On the 29th, 30th, and 31st March the most severe fighting took place about 10 miles to the north of Montdidier, and here in these last days of the month the enemy succeeded in pushing a little further forward. It thus came about that immediately to the east of Amiens there were two threatening salients formed by the German advances. And the salient to the north

of Montdidier was even nearer Amiens than that around Montdidier itself; and here to the north the Germans were not more than 12 miles from Amiens. During the last days of this first great advance upon Amiens the losses of the Allies in prisoners and guns continued to be serious, and on March 29 the Germans reported that they had taken altogether 70,000 prisoners and 1,100 guns, and that of these no fewer than 40,000 prisoners and 600 guns had been taken by the army commanded by General von Hutier, who had first caused the great break in Gough's line west of St. Quentin.

In the first few days of April it became apparent that the German rush had been stemmed, at least temporarily. Their advances had now become purely local in character, and French and British reinforcements continued to arrive from all directions. In particular, the British Government decided that it was safe to deplete largely the great army which had hitherto been kept at Home, and several hundred thousand men were rushed across the Channel at the end of March and during April. British troops were also brought up from Italy. In addition to this, an important decision was taken by the United States Government. The American authorities agreed that the numerous regiments of American troops in France, who were only partially trained and who were not at the time sufficiently practised in their larger manœuvres to go into action as separate American Divisions, should be temporarily brigaded with French or British battalions in order to satisfy somewhat the extreme need for man-power which would necessarily continue to exist for the next few weeks.

In the meantime, on March 28, the enemy attacked to the north of the Scarpe with the evident intention of capturing Arras, but in this region his assault completely failed, partly because his new method of attack had now been realised and understood by the British and partly also on account of the fact that he was not on this occasion (as he had been at St. Quentin) favoured by a thick fog. During the first three days of April the offensive died down, but on the 4th the Germans attacked again east of Amiens with new divisions which they had brought up from their reserve. The successes gained were of the slightest and most local significance; all the main roads to Amiens were held, and between Hamel and the road to Roye, where some of the fiercest assaults were delivered, even the advanced positions of the Allies were firmly maintained; and in this new attack only a few villages such as Morisel and Mailly-Raineval had to be surrendered to the attacking troops. After this failure, the public in France and England became somewhat more confident of the security of Amiens and of the communications between the British and French Armies. It was clear that the success of the German rush upon Amiens had depended mainly upon speed, and so soon as the pace began to slow down, that is, at the end of the first week, the position of the Allies ceased to

appear so perilous. Forty-six British infantry divisions and three cavalry divisions were engaged in defending Amiens, in this great battle.

It was soon evident that the German General Staff themselves realised that their first great rush had failed, notwithstanding the great captures they had made both in prisoners and in guns. The attacks on that part of the front ceased; and a new offensive was opened considerably further north. This new offensive was of smaller magnitude than the first, but was no less violent. The new front attacked was between Ypres and La Bassée; and just as the great objective of the first attack was to separate the British and French Armies, so it was evident that the strategic aim of this new offensive was to drive the British back upon the Channel ports, Dunkirk, Calais, and Boulogne; and by confining them within this small area and with their backs to the sea, to render an effectual defensive impracticable. In other words, the effort to separate the British from the French, as a preliminary to the annihilation of the British Army, having failed, a direct frontal assault upon the British Army was to be made, with, of course, the same ambitious object in view.

The second offensive, like the first, was successful at the outset, and the British and Portuguese troops (for the latter were holding a small part of this front) were driven back by the first assault. On the morning of April 9, screened once more by a fog, the Germans attacked the front from Armentières to La Bassée. This part of the British front had been shelled heavily for several days so that Sir Douglas Haig was of course not unaware that an attack might be impending in this area. But owing to the fog the enemy once more succeeded in effecting a partial surprise, since it was of course impossible to know the exact hour which von Ludendorff would select for his new attack. It was the right wing of the British Second Army (under General Sir H. Plumer) and the left wing of the First Army (under General Sir H. Horne) which were involved in this battle.

As the struggle proceeded it became more and more intense in character; and the developments were in fact even more menacing to the British than the battle of Amiens. On the 10th the battle raged along the whole of the 20-mile front, but was most severe upon the two flanks. In the north the eastern slopes of the famous Messines Ridge were attacked, but in the initial assaults the Germans obtained very little success. On the southern wing a furious struggle took place for the passage of the river Lys, and the Germans effected crossings (which, however, they could only temporarily hold) a few miles to the south of Armentières. In the first two days of this battle, which may be called the Battle of Armentières, the German reports claimed that over 100 guns and over 6,000 British and Portuguese prisoners were captured. On the evening of the

10th the British were obliged to evacuate the town of Armentières, which was in a severely damaged condition and which had suffered an especially severe bombardment from gas shells. The Germans stated that 50 British officers and 3,000 men were captured in the town, after offering a gallant resistance. On the 11th the German advances became very threatening, both on the right and on the left wing. On that day the enemy progressed several miles on the north, and they also made a desperate attack on the British lines along the river Lawe, a tributary of the Lys. The importance of the Lawe lay in the fact that it covered the large town of Bethune. Along this part of the line, however, the British held their ground after a desperate struggle, and the 51st Division, which was posted in this sector, was specially commended for its behaviour. On the third day the Germans claimed to have captured another hundred guns and 14,000 prisoners; and on the 12th they succeeded in advancing still further.

The position had now become very menacing, and on April 13, Field-Marshal Sir Douglas Haig issued an Order of the Day to all the troops in France, couched in terms which would certainly not have been employed except in a particularly dangerous situation.

This order may be quoted verbatim. It was as follows:—

“To all ranks of the British Army in France and Flanders.

“Three weeks ago to-day the enemy began his terrific attacks against us on a 50-mile front. His objects are to separate us from the French, to take the Channel Ports, and destroy the British Army.

“In spite of throwing already 106 divisions into the battle, and enduring the most reckless sacrifice of human life, he has as yet made little progress towards his goal. We owe this to the determined fighting and self-sacrifice of our troops.

“Words fail me to express the admiration which I feel for the splendid resistance offered by all ranks of our Army under the most trying circumstances.

“Many amongst us now are tired. To those I would say that victory will belong to the side which holds out the longest.

“The French Army is moving rapidly and in great force to our support.

“There is no other course open to us but to fight it out. Every position must be held to the last man: there must be no retirement. With our backs to the wall, and believing in the justice of our cause, each one of us must fight on to the end.

“The safety of our homes and the freedom of mankind depend alike upon the conduct of each one of us at this critical moment.”

The British Army rallied heroically in response to this order, which should become historic. And except in the extreme north the Germans, in spite of great sacrifices, made little further progress on this part of the Western Front.

Up to this date the British and French forces in France had been organised throughout as entirely separate Armies, although for many months there had been an agitation in various quarters, both well informed and badly informed, that the two Armies should be placed under a single Generalissimo. This reform had, however, met with strong opposition, notwithstanding the fact that it was known to be favoured by the British Prime Minister. In the intense stress of the existing circumstances, however, Mr. Lloyd George succeeded in obtaining the general consent of the British Cabinet to the plan of placing both Armies under the command of a French General; and on April 16 the announcement was made that General Foch had been appointed "Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Armies in France."¹ The reader will remember that General Foch had greatly distinguished himself throughout the war; and his name will always be associated with his command of the Army of Paris in September, 1914, when he came down upon von Kluck's flank and was thereby mainly responsible for the winning of the Battle of the Marne.

As already stated, the Germans succeeded in advancing somewhat further on the British left flank and the town of Bailleul fell on April 15; and on the 16th the enemy gained a still more important success in the capture of the famous Messines Ridge. The Germans pressed on rapidly in an attempt to take the next hill, which was known as Mount Kemmel, but here they once more met with a severe check. Nevertheless, the impetus of the enemy's offensive had not yet spent itself, and on April 26 both the village of Kemmel and Mount Kemmel itself were lost to the Allies. At the end of the struggle in this quarter, these positions were mainly defended by French troops, who had now arrived upon the scene. During the first few days of May violent attempts were made by the Germans to extend further their successes in this battle of Armentières; but in all cases the assaulting lines were driven back with terrible losses. Thus the battle ended, as the Battle of Amiens had done, in what it is legitimate to describe as a German defeat; for notwithstanding the preliminary successes obtained by the enemy, he had in both cases alike failed to win the great strategic object which he had in view. And, furthermore, his territorial gains had only been achieved at a cost which, as subsequent events show, he could ill afford.

This, however, was by no means the end of von Ludendorff's attempt to reach a decision on the main front. After the failure of the move on the Channel ports, there was, indeed, a pause for several weeks, but at the end of May the fighting broke out afresh. On this occasion the front attacked was that running north of Aisne, west of Reims. The attack was

¹ It appears that Foch had been in supreme command, for all practical purposes, since March 26,

launched on the morning of May 27, and the German infantry were supported by numerous "tanks." The offensive extended over a distance of about 30 miles, from Vauxaillon, a village situated about 10 miles north of Soissons, to the immediate vicinity of Reims. The defending troops in this region were mainly French, but several British divisions were stationed on the Allied right wing. The British troops held their ground, but the greater part of the French line was overwhelmed in the first rush, and the Germans made their way rapidly across the ridge of the Chemin des Dames and down into the valley of the Aisne. The enemy gained 5 miles in the first day.

On May 28 the German rush continued with unabated fury. The enemy's centre crossed the Aisne between Vailly and Berry-au-Bac; and pushing forward rapidly, the advanced troops reached and crossed the Vesle, no less than 12 miles from the line held by them on the previous morning. Owing to the loss of ground by the French, the British divisions on the right (which were the 8th, 21st, 25th, and 50th divisions) were necessarily compelled to retire.

On the third day the Allied wings, especially the left wing, gave way, and Brandenburg troops captured Soissons. The enemy reached the outskirts of Reims, but were unable to obtain possession of that city. In the centre the Germans advanced towards the Marne, and reached Fère. On May 30 the Allied reserves arrived in force, and the speed of the advance was consequently not quite so menacing. The enemy were not yet brought to a halt, however. On the contrary, they extended the offensive along the front westwards as far as a point 20 miles west of Soissons, and gained ground also in this new sector. On May 31 the Germans reached the Marne on a front of about 10 miles, from Château-Thierry to Dormans. The German General Staff claimed to have captured 400 guns and 45,000 prisoners in the first four days.

Having reached the Marne, the Germans altered the direction of their blows, and struck westwards, directly at Paris, along a line running from Soissons to Château-Thierry. They gained ground, and reached the edge of the Forest of Villers-Cotterets, about 40 miles distant from the capital. Having reached the wooded country, however, they were unable to make any further progress in this direction, and a pause lasting several days ensued.

On June 9 the Germans made what must be regarded as an extension of this Battle of Soissons. They attacked along the line from Montdidier to Noyon, a distance of over 20 miles, and in the centre gained about 5 miles on the first day. Thus the line attacked in the Battle of Soissons extended from Montdidier to Reims, a distance of about 70 miles. Along the right bank of the Oise the Germans, commanded on this front by von Hutier, made some progress, and it was clear that the general was aiming at Compiègne. After the first few

days, however, the enemy gained no further ground, and the offensive was therefore once more abortive. The French withdrew about 4 miles on the left bank of the Oise, in consequence of the sharp salient in their line which was produced by the German success on the right bank. The Germans claimed that they captured over 300 guns between Montdidier and Noyon. Furthermore, it is of some interest to note that on July 1 the authorities at the German Headquarters issued a statement of their total captures between March 21 and the end of June. These captures included, so it was alleged, 2,476 guns and 15,024 machine-guns. The number of unwounded prisoners was 191,454, of whom 94,939 were British.

The next phase of the enemy's great effort to crush the continental Allies took the form of an Austro-Hungarian offensive against the Italians. This opened on June 15, and the whole line from Asiago to the sea was attacked. The offensive was a complete failure. In the mountains, more particularly on the portion of the Asiago plateau held by the British, the Austrians failed to gain any ground, even in the initial assault— notwithstanding that in these offensives the initial move always proved the most threatening. Along the Piave, however, certain successes were obtained at the beginning. The river was crossed at several points, notably at the south-east corner of the Montello, by Nervesa, and much lower down at Fagare and at Musile. The Austrians captured part of the Montello ridge, and at the other extremity of the line—the front attacked was over 70 miles in length—they took Capo Sile, by the Venetian lagoons. In four days the Austrians took 30,000 prisoners, but the Italians had no lack of reserves, and powerful and effective counter-attacks were made.

At this point nature came to assist in the discomfiture of the invaders. Heavy rains fell and the Piave quickly became flooded. The Austrian bridges were swept away, and communication between the two banks became difficult or impossible. The unhappy Austrians on the right bank, on which their foothold had never been anything but precarious, were now in a perilous and helpless position. Nervesa and Capo Sile were retaken. On the night of June 22 the Austrian commanders decided to retreat, and a rearguard consisting mainly of machine-gun contingents was promptly organised. Within a few hours, however, the Italians discovered the weakness of the troops opposing them, and the rearguard was quickly crushed. An Austrian disaster ensued, and the enemy's casualties in recrossing the river were very heavy. The last Austrians on the right bank were either killed or taken prisoner on June 24. In this battle the Italians captured over 20,000 prisoners and about sixty guns.

Baffled in France, thwarted in Italy, the Central Powers nevertheless made one last attempt to bring the war to an issue.

On July 15 Ludendorff once more sent his men forward on a front of 50 miles, the city of Reims being this time the mid-point of the attack. East of Reims, as far as Massiges, the assaults failed with heavy losses. West of the city, as far as Fossoy, on the Marne, some initial successes were obtained. The river Marne itself was crossed at and above Fossoy.

The Germans advanced about 3 miles south of the river, but met with a significantly steady resistance from the French troops, and also from the American contingents who were now stationed here. The Germans were across the river from Fossoy almost as far as Boursault. On July 17 the Germans attacked the French positions on the heights of Monthodon, but failed to win the key positions in this locality. This was the furthest point reached, the acme of the German advance into French territory in 1918. On the following day, having waited coolly through four months of battle, Marshal Foch delivered his great counter-offensive.

CHAPTER III.

THE VICTORY OF THE ASSOCIATED POWERS.

THE process by which the Entente Powers and the United States of America won their complete victory was manifold. They brought to bear upon the enemy a crushing pressure from all directions, from the sea, from the air, in the economic sphere, and finally on land. The strictly military pressure did not become menacing, or even very formidable (apart from the original Russian offensive) until July, 1918, but the naval and economic forces began to cause deadly distress and strangulation in Central Europe at a much earlier date. And even at the end it was mainly the naval power of the Entente which brought about the final collapse, for the technical and mechanical superiority which the Allied armies eventually enjoyed was itself the result, in the main, of their freedom to communicate with the resources of the whole world. Although the military triumphs of the French, British, and American Armies came last in order of time, it is, however, convenient to deal first with these final events of the war on land, since they form at once the sequel and the reversal of the operations described in the last chapter.

THE GREAT OFFENSIVES IN FRANCE AND ITALY.

The last German offensive, when the enemy made a crossing of the Marne, was the weakest of the great series of assaults delivered in the early part of the summer. It was promptly stopped by the French. And then, on July 18, Marshal Foch began the great counter-offensive which he had been quietly preparing for many weeks. Early in the morning of that day

the French and American troops struck a tremendous blow against the right flank of the German Army whose advanced divisions had crossed the Marne. The offensive was on a front of nearly 30 miles from Fontenoy (on the Aisne, west of Soissons) to Belleau, a few miles to the west of Château-Thierry. The initial assault was delivered entirely without artillery preparation, but the infantry were preceded by a large fleet of tanks. On the first day the French and American troops advanced at least 3 miles on the whole front, and at certain points advanced as much as 8 miles.

Within a few days, the essential difference between this decisive offensive of the Allies and the previous offensives of the Germans became apparent. The advance of the Allies was a continuous movement, whereas the German advances, formidable and dangerous though they were, had been made up of a series of brief isolated rushes, each of which had been brought to a complete halt within a few days. The Allies never at any moment executed quite such swift rushes as the Germans performed in their most effective offensives, but from July 18 onwards the Allied Armies were never really stopped. Their advance was resistless.

The progress of the Franco-American Armies continued on July 19, especially on the northern sector of the front, between the Aisne and the Ourcq. The troops here were under the command of General Mangin, those south of the Ourcq were led by General Dégoutte. In the first two days 360 guns and 17,000 prisoners were captured. On July 22 the French recaptured Château-Thierry, and the threat to the Germans' new salient south of the Marne thus became so serious, that the enemy beat a speedy retreat to the right bank. The Allies promptly won crossings of the river near Dormans. During the next few days the advance, though not rapid, was steady and never ceased. The French troops advancing from across the Marne fought their way northwards, and on July 28 they retook Fère and forced a passage of the Ourcq, and by this date the Germans were in all places behind the lines from which they started on July 15. It is notable that an American contingent fighting near the village of Sergy was attacked by the 4th Division of the Prussian Guards whom they repulsed with heavy losses. In the fighting in this Reims-Soissons region 71 German divisions were reported to have been engaged between July 15 and the end of the month. At the end of July British contingents reinforced the French on the Ourcq.

During the first few days of August the most important fighting continued to be in the same district. On August 2 the Allies re-entered Soissons, and two days later the Germans retreated behind the line of the Aisne, and also behind the river Vesle.

At this point the German Headquarters Staff seem to have realised that they would henceforth be compelled to wage a

purely defensive struggle, for they ordered spontaneously retirements to defensive positions near Montdidier and also on the Ancre, in front of the British. Nor were they mistaken, for on August 8 an Allied offensive was launched on a new sector. The new assault was delivered on the line running from Morlancourt (north of the Somme) to Braches on the Avre, and it was carried out by the British Fourth Army (under General Sir H. Rawlinson) and the French First Army. The immediate object of the new offensive was evidently to drive the enemy back from his positions near Amiens, where his presence had constantly hampered the communication between the French and British Armies, ever since the March offensive.

The British broke through at the first assault, and cavalry and light tanks pursued the fleeing Germans. At some points an advance of 7 miles was made on the first day, and in five days the Fourth Army captured 400 guns and nearly 22,000 prisoners. On August 10 the French, who had extended their offensive southwards, recaptured Montdidier, and on the 15th they carried a ridge known as the Lassigny *massif*, which dominated Roye and Noyon.

On August 21 a new offensive was set in motion by Sir Douglas Haig. The attack took place on a front of 10 miles, north of the Ancre, and the troops operating were those of the Third Army under General Sir J. Byng. The initial attack was aided by fog, and there was no artillery preparation. Tanks played a great part in the attack. On the next day the offensive was extended southwards and Albert was taken. Meanwhile, the French were co-operating on the right, and Chaumes, Nesle, and Roye were retaken by them. The British Fourth Army also came into action (between Sir Julian Byng and the French), and thus at the end of August the entire Allied line from Arras to Soissons was steadily advancing. On the 29th the New Zealand troops took Bapaume and the French captured Noyon.

It was at this stage of the offensive, after the Allies had been attacking and advancing successfully for six weeks, that the most decisive blow of the entire summer campaign was struck. In their retirement east of Arras the Germans had reached the elaborate and formidable defensive line which they had constructed on chosen ground when they executed their voluntary retirement in the early spring of 1917. This line was familiarly known as the "Hindenburg Line," and the northern portion of it now reached was called the "Drocourt-Quéant Switch Line." The Hindenburg Line was the strongest part of the entire German defensive system in France, and the Drocourt-Quéant section was considered the key of the famous Line, and was deemed invulnerable.

At the end of August the First Army, under General Sir Henry Horne, had come into action, and was operating north of Sir J. Byng. The right wing of the First Army was

composed of the Canadian Corps commanded by Lieut.-General Sir A. W. Currie. Now after advancing for several days the Canadian Corps and the extreme left of the Third Army were brought up against the Drocourt-Quéant Line. There was no halt. At 5 A.M. on September 2 the 1st and 4th Canadian divisions together with the 4th English division (which appears to have formed part of the Canadian Corps) were sent to the attack. On their right the 52nd, 57th, and 63rd divisions, the left wing of the Third Army, co-operated in the assault. The attack was assisted by forty tanks of the 3rd Tank Brigade, and by motor machine-gun units and Canadian cavalry. The offensive was entirely successful, and advancing rapidly south of the Trinquis Brook, the Canadians and their comrades captured the key positions of the famous Drocourt-Quéant Line.

The Germans were so greatly weakened by the successive blows which had been showered upon them that they were unable to make any really formidable attempts to reconquer the Switch Line, and from this point onwards, through the remaining two months of the campaign, their retreat became continually more and more rapid, until finally it was little better than a rout. During August the British captured 57,318 prisoners and 657 guns.

The entire line from the North Sea to Nancy was driven back and great assaults were delivered in rapid succession in all parts of the front. Peronne fell on September 1. After taking Dury, Villers, and Cognicourt on September 2, the Canadians pressed onwards and were soon threatening Cambrai from the north-west. This caused the German divisions operating to the south of those defeated at Quéant to beat a rapid retreat to the main portion of the Hindenburg Line.

The next great Allied advance was on an entirely different part of the line. It will be remembered that ever since 1914 the German line south of Verdun had formed a pronounced salient with its apex at St. Mihiel. The American Army was now stationed in this region, and on September 12 General Pershing, the Commander-in-Chief, sent his troops to the attack in order to destroy this salient. He was eminently successful. In two days the entire salient was flattened out, this operation involving an advance of nearly 20 miles in the centre. The Americans captured 200 guns and 15,000 prisoners. The German General Staff alleged that the retreat was voluntary and that it had long been contemplated (which was likely enough), but the number of guns captured goes to disprove the assertion that the retirement was a matter of choice.

On September 26 the American Army again came prominently into action. The Americans and the French Army, under General Gouraud, carried out a great combined offensive in the Argonne, on a front of 40 miles, westwards of the Meuse. The Americans advanced to a depth of 7 miles, freeing many villages from the enemy. During the next few days further advances were made.

On September 28 a new offensive was opened in the extreme north by a combined British and Belgian Army under the supreme command of King Albert. The British contingent was the Second Army. The offensive was on a front of 23 miles, from Dixmude to Ploegsteert. On the first day Dixmude, the Forest of Houthulst, Stadenberg, Westroosebeke, Passchendaele, Moorslede, Gheluvelt, and Messines were captured. After this there was never again any deadlock in north-western Belgium.

During October the retreat became a rout all along the line. The magnitude of the repeated German disasters may be imagined, when it is stated that in three days at the end of September the British captured 300 guns on the Cambrai front alone.

On September 29 the French got across the Bazancourt-Challerange railway, which was most important for the lateral communications of the enemy, and had long been an objective of French offensives in Champagne.

The British captured over 700 guns and about 65,000 prisoners in September. It is also notable that in the two months from August 8 onwards the Canadian Army alone captured 500 guns and 28,000 prisoners. During September the French, Americans, and Belgians together captured about 900 guns.

The great town of St. Quentin fell to the French on October 1, and on the 9th and 10th respectively the British entered Cambrai and Le Cateau. French forces which had been moved up north took Roulers on October 14. During the next few days the advance in Belgium was very rapid. King Albert's Army met with but feeble resistance and pursued the enemy across the flats. The Germans evacuated Ostend on October 17, and on the afternoon of that day Sir Roger Keyes, commanding the Dover Patrol Force, landed and took possession of the town. Belgian soldiers also entered the port from the south. Another notable conquest was Lille, which was entered by the British Fifth Army (now commanded by General Birdwood) on October 17. On the same day the British took Douai.

In the next three days the Germans abandoned the entire Belgian coast, and withdrew their right wing along the Dutch frontier. They evacuated Bruges on October 20.

The further east the British, French, American, and Belgian armies progressed, the weaker became the opposition which they experienced.

On November 2 British troops entered Valenciennes. Further south a Franco-American Army began an offensive between the Aisne and the Meuse on the same day, and advancing rapidly they completely cleared the Argonne of the enemy. In two days the Americans advanced 13 miles, and pushing on without pause they entered Sedan on November 6. Meanwhile, negotiations for an armistice with Germany were opened, but this did not cause a halt in the British or Franco-American

offensives. The momentous armistice was signed early in the morning of November 11, and came into force at 11 A.M. on that day. It was a dramatic incident that early that morning Canadian troops entered Mons.

In the last phase of the war the Italian Armies were not idle. At the end of October a general offensive against the now decomposing Austro-Hungarian Army was undertaken. The offensive, as stated, was general, but special interest attached to the operations of the Italian Tenth Army, which was composed of both Italian and British troops and was under the command of Lord Cavan. On October 26 this army forced a crossing of the Piave, at the island of Grave di Papadopoli, about 10 miles below the Montello. Further north the 8th and 12th Armies also forced passages of the river at many points. The defence was weak, except in localities where German-Austrian or Magyar contingents still retained their morale, and Lord Cavan's troops advanced 9 miles north-east of the Piave in four days. Owing to Lord Cavan's advance the Austrians further south were obliged to fall back in order to avoid being outflanked, and this in turn enabled the Italian Third Army, stationed between Lord Cavan and the sea, to cross the lower Piave at San Dona di Piave. On October 30 the Eighth Army captured the important railway junction of Conegliano, and up to that date the combined forces had taken over 33,000 prisoners. On November 1 advanced guards of Cavalry crossed the Livenza. Two days later the Austro-Hungarian Government (if such a body could now be said to exist) capitulated, and an armistice was signed on November 3; and this took effect on November 4 [v. "Public Documents"]. The captures of prisoners during the last three or four days were on a stupendous scale. It was stated that the Allied Armies on the Italian Front captured, between October 24 and November 4, 300,000 prisoners and 5,000 guns. Excepting isolated instances of bravery on the part of certain detachments, the morale of the enemy completely collapsed. Thus the Italian War ended with a victory much more complete than most observers had thought probable since the defeats of the previous autumn. It should be added that on November 3 Italian military and naval forces landed at Trieste.

THE MACEDONIAN VICTORIES.

The final developments of the war afforded a dramatic justification of the theories of those strategists who had always contended that it was advisable to attack the Central Powers in the Near East as well as in Western Europe. The first of the mighty series of blows which brought down Central Europe in ruins in the autumn of 1918 was delivered by that same Salonika Army, whose very existence as such had given rise to much criticism, and which had certainly been almost exclusively en-

gaged in marking time since 1915. This army was now commanded by General Franchet d'Esperey, in succession to General Sarraïl.

During the earlier part of the year very little fighting occurred in this theatre. But on September 15 the Allied forces—French, Serbian, British, Greek, and some escaped Jugo-Slav volunteers—delivered an offensive on the largest scale. The chief assault was made by the French and Serbians, and the French succeeded in piercing the Bulgarian front between Dobropolje and Vetrenik, on the Serbo-Greek border. In the first two days 4,000 prisoners and 30 guns were captured, in spite of a stubborn resistance. On the 18th the French reached the Tcherná, 10 miles behind the Bulgarian lines. On the same day the British and Greek contingents made an attack near Lake Doiran, in order to prevent any transference of reinforcements to the Tcherná front. This object was achieved, and within a few days panic ensued in the Bulgarian ranks, and the soldiers fled for their lives, pursued by cavalry. French horsemen reached Prilep on the 23rd and Ishtip two days later. British cavalry also came into action, and drove the terror-stricken Bulgars towards the Strumnitza. On September 29 the French entered Uskub, a success which would have had the effect of almost severing communications between the eastern and western wings of the Bulgarian Army, if the hostilities had been continued. .

But the Bulgarians had no spirit for the fight, and as early as the 26th they approached General d'Esperey with overtures for an armistice. The Bulgarians asked for a temporary suspension of hostilities pending an agreement on the terms of a formal armistice, but this request was refused. The Bulgars, however, were prepared to capitulate, and on September 28 an armistice was signed at Salonika, by the terms of which the Bulgarian Government agreed to evacuate Greek and Serbian territory, to demobilise the Army, with the surrender of all its arms and munitions, to give over to the Allies all means of transport, including railways and vessels on the Danube, and to permit the use of Bulgarian territory generally for the purpose of the prosecution of the war against the Central Powers. The Allies agreed that the occupation of Bulgarian territory should be undertaken by French, British, or Italian troops, not by Serbians or Greeks. The convention, it will be noticed, was purely military in character and did not involve political or territorial issues.¹

There were a few German and Austro-Hungarian troops in Serbia, but these forces were too weak seriously to contest the Allied advance, and Austria-Hungary, now in the last stages of decrepitude, was quite unable to dispatch adequate reinforcements to the scene. The Serbians entered Nish on October 12, and arrived at Belgrade on November 1. In the meantime, the

¹ Further particulars of this armistice will be found under Bulgaria.

French reached the Danube at Vidin on October 19 and took measures to stop traffic on the river. It was reported on October 14 that the Allies captured 2,000 guns in the final operations against Bulgaria.

Whilst these operations were taking place in Serbia and Bulgaria, an advance was also carried out in Albania. The Italian forces stationed in the south of the province commenced an offensive on October 1, and drove the Austrians north, and entered Elbasan on October 7. Durazzo, which had become an important Austro-Hungarian naval base, was occupied on October 15, and by the end of the month the Italians had reached the Montenegrin frontier.

The operations in Mesopotamia and Palestine, described elsewhere, had the effect of inducing the Ottoman Empire to surrender, and an armistice with that Power was signed on October 30.¹

THE WAR AT SEA.

It has been pointed out already more than once that the German submarine campaign was the most vitally important part of the whole war. No German successes on land could have ruined or even very gravely injured the English-speaking Powers. The success of the submarine campaign, on the other hand, would have left the United States isolated and have placed the Berlin Government in a position to dominate most of the rest of the world. Now the submarines attained a very considerable measure of success in 1917, and the gradual defeat of this menace in 1918 has now to be recorded. It is obvious that the defensive measures against the ruthless depredations among merchant shipping carried out by the submarines fall at once into two classes. In the first place it was possible to devise methods of attacking and destroying the under-water vessels themselves. And it was, secondly, practicable to increase the output of the shipping yards. The part played by Great Britain in the first sphere of action was brilliant and pre-eminent. But the increase in the total tonnage of ships built in the United Kingdom was somewhat disappointing.

The story of this part of the war is necessarily statistical. It was clear that so soon as the new tonnage built by the United Kingdom, the Associated Powers, and neutrals exceeded, month by month, the sinkings by submarines and other losses (for losses from other causes were by no means a negligible quantity), the menace might be said to be mastered, although the net loss in 1917 should not be forgotten. In the spring the British Government altered the character of their reports on shipping losses, and began to give out totals of tonnage lost. This was of course a satisfactory innovation, and it thereafter became possible to give a much more exact and reliable account of what was actually taking place in this vital matter.

¹ Further particulars of this armistice will be found in "Public Documents".

During the year 1917 the submarines sank over 6,000,000 tons of merchant shipping—British, Associated, and neutral. The tonnage possessed by the world (exclusive of Central Europe) at the beginning of the war was 33,000,000 tons, of which the United Kingdom possessed 18,000,000. The net reduction in the world's tonnage on December 31, 1917, was only 2,500,000. The net reduction of British tonnage was, however, no less than 3,500,000. Most of the damage had been done in 1917, the chief favourable factor being the advancement of the American mercantile marine. The dangerous character of the menace immediately after the unrestricted campaign was begun may be realised from the fact that in April, 1917, the submarines sank 894,000 tons, of which 555,000 tons were British.

The destruction in 1917 was as follows:—

| | British. | Associated and Neutral. | Total. |
|--------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|-----------|
| First Quarter - - - - - | 911,840 | 707,533 | 1,619,373 |
| Second Quarter - - - - - | 1,361,870 | 875,064 | 2,236,934 |
| Third Quarter - - - - - | 952,938 | 541,535 | 1,494,473 |
| Fourth Quarter - - - - - | 782,889 | 439,954 | 1,272,843 |
| | 4,009,537 | 2,614,086 | 6,623,623 |

The figures are given in gross tons.

The statistics may now be given in greater detail for 1918 up to the time of the armistice:—

| | British. | Associated and Neutral. | Total. |
|---------------------|-----------|----------------------------|-----------|
| January - - - - - | 218,621 | 140,842 | 359,463 |
| February - - - - - | 254,303 | 130,629 | 384,932 |
| March - - - - - | 224,744 | 174,197 | 398,941 |
| April - - - - - | 233,426 | 83,684 | 317,110 |
| May - - - - - | 231,787 | 134,756 | 366,543 |
| June - - - - - | 165,649 | 112,705 | 278,354 |
| July - - - - - | 182,524 | 142,314 | 324,838 |
| August - - - - - | 176,854 | 164,475 | 341,329 |
| September - - - - - | 152,652 | 96,694 | 249,346 |
| October - - - - - | 83,952 | 93,582 | 177,534 |
| | 1,925,512 | 1,273,878 | 3,199,390 |

Turning to another aspect of the matter, it appeared from statistics issued by the Government that the tonnage of steamships of 500 gross tons and over entering and clearing United Kingdom ports from and to ports overseas was on the average about 7,500,000 per month. From April to October, 1918, the lowest figure (April) was 7,040,309 and the highest (August) was 8,158,639. The figures for January and February were lower. The statistics did not include cross-channel traffic.

The statistical record of the shipbuilding has now to be given, and in this matter the point which is brought out most forcibly is the increase of "Associated and Neutral" building, a result which is due mainly to the energy of the Americans.

The figures (gross tons) for earlier years are as follows:—

| | United Kingdom. | Associated and Neutral. | Total. |
|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| 1915 - | 650,919 | 551,081 | 1,202,000 |
| 1916 - | 541,552 | 1,146,448 | 1,688,000 |
| 1917 - | 1,163,474 | 1,774,312 | 2,937,786 |

The total output of Associated and neutral countries during the first nine months of 1918 was approximately 2,323,080 tons, and during the last four months of the war the Associated and neutral countries collectively built more tonnage than they lost from all causes—submarines, mines, ordinary marine risks, etc. It was not until October that the British output exceeded the British losses, but for the last four months (July-October) the output of the world was greater than the losses—the British deficit being small.

The figures of British shipbuilding in 1918 were as follows:—

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------|
| January | 58,568 tons. | June | 134,159 tons. |
| February | 100,038 " | July | 141,948 " |
| March | 161,674 " | August | 124,675 " |
| April | 111,533 " | September | 144,772 " |
| May | 197,274 " | October | 136,000 " |

The total for the ten months was thus 1,310,741 tons—not a very striking result.

The increase of shipbuilding, particularly on the part of America, had been fairly satisfactory, but it would have been quite ineffectual without the success of the direct method of attack upon the submarines. It has been well said that "the hunters had become the hunted." Ships known as "submarine-chasers" had been provided in enormous numbers, and the under-sea vessels had been assailed (and also deceived) by every kind of ingenious device. It was stated officially that over 150 German submarines had been destroyed up to the end of July. Thus was the greatest peril to the Allied cause overcome. And the Allies had good cause to congratulate themselves upon their escape; for they owed their survival as much to German mistakes, as to their own vigilance and resource. It is clear, after the event, that, ethical considerations apart, the German Admiralty made a capital error of judgment in not postponing their "unrestricted" campaign until they had built a much larger number of submarines. If they had waited six months or twelve months longer, until they had increased their submarine fleet threefold or fourfold, and had then suddenly loosed their under-sea vessels into the ocean, it is difficult to believe that they would not have compassed the destruction of the Allies in a few weeks,

before the counter-measures could have been evolved. But the German Admiralty expected such a result from the fleet which they possessed in February, 1917. Thus did over-confidence wreck the cause of the Hohenzollern Empire.

Apart from the submarine campaign, a series of isolated naval incidents have to be described; and of these, by far the most notable was a daring and brilliant attack upon the Belgian coast, which was carried out on the night of April 22-23. The operation was directed by Vice-Admiral Roger Keyes, who was in command at Dover. The object of the attack was to sink old ships filled with concrete in the harbours at Ostend and Zeebrugge, in order to block the exits and thus prevent the use of those ports as bases for the enemy's destroyers and submarines. The attacks on the two ports were delivered under cover of an artificial fog specially devised by Wing-Commander F. A. Brock, R.A.F., who unfortunately lost his life during the operation.

Five obsolete cruisers were accordingly filled with concrete. Two of these, the *Sirius* and *Brilliant*, were to be run between the piers at Ostend and there blown up. The operation at Ostend should have been less difficult than that at Zeebrugge, but in fact it was the more audacious enterprise which was the more successful. Coastal motor-boats lit the approaches to Ostend harbour with flares, making at the same time a smoke-screen which hid the arrangements from the German batteries on shore. Before the two old cruisers reached the entrance to the harbour, however, the wind changed and blew away the smoke-screen, thus revealing the whole scheme to the Germans, who promptly extinguished the flares by gunfire. *Sirius* and *Brilliant* were already sinking, and they were blown up by their crews several hundred yards from the mouth of the harbour. The crews were saved by motor-launches.

The attack on Zeebrugge was planned and carried out with amazing audacity. The difficulty of the operation here consisted in the fact that it was necessary to block the mouth of the Bruges canal itself, since there is no narrow portion of Zeebrugge harbour. Three old cruisers were run in, the *Thetis*, *Intrepid*, and *Iphigenia*. The *Thetis* fouled her propeller in the protecting nets as she steamed in, but both the *Intrepid* (Lieutenant S. Bonham-Carter) and the *Iphigenia* (Lieutenant E. W. Billyard-Leake) reached the exit of the canal, and were there blown up. Subsequent observations by aircraft proved that the exit was thus blocked, and the operations involved in removing the obstructions must have necessitated many weeks of work on the part of the enemy.

Whilst the three cruisers were making their way into the harbour under cover of the fog, an attack and a landing on the mole were made in order to distract the attention of the astonished guardians of the port. The old cruiser *Vindictive* was fitted with a false deck and eighteen gangways, to be used by the

landing parties, and at the appointed hour she was run alongside the extremity of the mole. The *Vindictive* was under the command of Captain Alfred Carpenter, and two auxiliary vessels, the *Iris* and *Daffodil*, co-operated in the landing operation. Notwithstanding a violent fire from the shore-batteries, bodies of bluejackets and marines were landed and did much damage to the works on the mole. There seems to have been little or no fighting at close quarters, the Germans preferring to fire on the raiders with guns and machine-guns. In proportion to the numbers engaged, the British casualties were inevitably heavy, and both leaders of the landing parties (Colonel Elliot of the Royal Marines and Captain Halahan leading the bluejackets) were killed before they even set foot on the mole. At the conclusion of the attack, the survivors were taken on board; and the *Vindictive* and her consorts made good their retreat, though not without bearing marks of the encounter.

Soon after the *Vindictive* ran alongside the mole, an old submarine filled with high explosive, was run into the viaduct connecting the mole with the shore, and there blown up, thus preventing temporarily communication between Germans on the mole and their friends on shore. The crew of the submarine escaped in a small motor-skiff, most of them wounded. The whole operation was assisted by a large number of motor-launches and coastal motor-boats, and was protected by destroyers and cruisers further out at sea, among the larger vessels being a squadron from Harwich under command of Admiral Tyrwhitt. One British destroyer and four motor-boats were sunk.

The end of the *Vindictive* was appropriate. On the night of May 10, manned by a different crew, she was run between the piers at Ostend, and blown up. And she lay there, a concrete-filled hulk, seriously obstructing the fairway. She was commanded by Commander A. E. Godsal.

The remaining incidents which have to be recorded were less exciting in character. On May 23 the British "mercantile cruiser" named the *Moldavia* (formerly of the P. & O.) was torpedoed in the English Channel by a submarine and sank. She was carrying American troops, of whom fifty-six were killed by the explosion or drowned. Three days later a British transport, the *Leasowe Castle*, was torpedoed and sunk by a submarine in the Mediterranean. Ninety-two of the military and nine of the crew were lost. A few days later several German submarines appeared off the coast of the United States and sank about fourteen vessels, most of them of small size. The largest ship sunk was the *Carolina* of 5,000 tons.

On July 12 the Japanese Dreadnought battleship, the *Kawachi*, was blown up in Tokuyama Bay, with 500 casualties. She was a vessel of 21,500 tons and was built in 1912. On July 15 the British transport *Barunga* (formerly the German S.S.

Sumatra), outward bound to Australia, was torpedoed and sunk by a submarine. At the end of July submarines made a further raid upon the American coastal shipping, but with less success than on the former occasion. On July 23 the *Justicia*, a 32,000 ton White Star Liner, was sunk off the north coast of Ireland by submarines. She was being escorted by destroyers, and a long fight took place in which one of the submarines was sunk by the destroyer *Marne*. She was carrying no passengers and only ten of her crew were lost. The British armed mercantile cruiser *Marmora* was sunk by a submarine on the same day, losing ten of her crew.

Early in the morning on August 3 a specially deplorable incident occurred. The ambulance transport *Warilda*, homeward bound, was torpedoed and sunk in the English Channel. She was carrying many seriously wounded soldiers and a detachment of Queen Mary's Auxiliary Army Corps. Fortunately the ship did not sink immediately, and of the 800 persons on board, the majority (nearly 700) were saved. Among the drowned was Mrs. Violet Long, one of the chief commandants of Queen Mary's A.A.C., a lady who had greatly distinguished herself in that capacity, and had been awarded the O.B.E.

On August 11 a fight took place off the West Frisian coast between British light naval forces and German aircraft, one Zeppelin being destroyed. Six British motor-boats were sunk. A German naval squadron appears to have come up after the action was terminated.

The port of Durazzo was attacked by British and Italian warships on October 4, and was severely damaged.

On October 10 the Irish Mail Boat *Leinster* was sunk by a submarine when outward bound from Kingstown. Out of 700 persons on board, including many women and children, about 450 were unhappily lost.

On October 6 the British Armed Mercantile Cruiser *Otranto*, carrying American troops, was in collision with S.S. *Kashmir*, and drifted ashore completely wrecked on the Island of Islay. Over 1,000 persons were on board, of whom 431 were lost.

On December 4 the light cruiser *Cassandra* struck a mine in the Baltic and sank, with the loss of eleven of her crew.

An incident of a different character took place in the Baltic at the beginning of April. Seven British submarines, which had been attached to the Russian fleet, were sunk by order to prevent their capture by the Germans. Four were of Class E, and three of Class C. Two of the E boats had been in the Baltic since October, 1914.

THE AERIAL WAR.

The war in the air once more consisted in the main of countless combats along and beyond the chief military fronts. British aeroplanes also carried out constant raids upon the

towns of Western Germany. The immense numbers of aircraft employed by the belligerents may be realised from the fact that between July 1, 1917, and June 30, 1918, the British Air Force destroyed 2,150 German aeroplanes on the Western Front alone, whilst 1,083 were "driven down out of control." On the same front during the same period the British lost 1,094 machines. During the one month of September, 1918, the British destroyed 383 German aeroplanes on the Western Front, and brought down 199 out of control. They also destroyed sixty-two balloons. In the same period the British lost 297 machines.

The Germans carried out a few more raids upon England, both by airships and aeroplanes. The most serious of these was an attack upon London and the south-east coast by a large squadron of nearly thirty aeroplanes on the night of May 19. Some of the aeroplanes penetrated the defences of the metropolis, and about forty persons were killed and about 160 were injured in London alone. The casualties elsewhere were less numerous, but the material damage was considerable, both in London and outside. Six of the aeroplanes were brought down by gun-fire or by the Royal Air Force.

On July 19 British seaplanes bombed the Zeppelin sheds at Tondern, in Schleswig, and did much damage. Four British machines failed to return, of which three, however, succeeded in alighting in Danish territory.

On the night of August 5-6 five Zeppelins raided the East Anglian coast. One of the vessels was brought down in flames into the sea by detachments of the Royal Air Force.

THE ARMISTICE.

The capitulation of Bulgaria and Turkey, and the surrender of the Austro-Hungarian Government, together with the dissolution of the Dual Monarchy, caused the German Government, now led by Prince Max of Baden, to decide to accept a peace on the lines of President Wilson's famous "Fourteen Points" and to seek for an armistice on that basis. The German Government inquired of the American Government whether the European Allies also agreed to accept the Fourteen Points as a basis of peace, and on November 4 it was announced on behalf of Great Britain, France, and Italy that those Powers accepted the Fourteen Points subject to a reservation on the so-called "freedom of the seas" and to a second reservation on the question of exacting reparation from Germany for damage done in invaded territory. With these two qualifications, therefore, President Wilson's dicta were formally accepted by all parties as the basis of the future treaty of peace. This point having been settled it only remained to arrange the armistice. The terms of the armistice were decided by the Associated Governments and were communicated to Marshal Foch and

Admiral Sir R. Wemyss, who were authorised to convey them to the Germans. A German delegation, headed by Herr Erzberger and General von Gündell, approached the French lines on November 7. They were conducted through the French lines, and on the following day they formally applied for an armistice from Marshal Foch. The latter read out the terms which had been drawn up, and the Germans were given seventy-two hours in which to accept or reject them. Herr Erzberger declared himself astonished at their severity and asked to be allowed to communicate with the German headquarters, which were then at Spa. The member of the delegation whose services were used as courier, a certain Captain Helldorf, was delayed on his journey to Spa by a misunderstanding on the part of the German High Command in regard to the arrangements for a cease-fire along the route he was to travel; and hence the armistice was not actually signed until 5 A.M. on Monday, November 11. It came into force at 11 A.M. (French time) on that day. Before that hour, as already stated, Canadian troops captured the town of Mons, so that, from the British point of view, the war may be said to have ended at the spot where it began. In the meantime, it was announced on November 9 that the Emperor William had abdicated. On most parts of the front, fighting continued during the six hours interval between the signing of the armistice and the moment at which it came into operation. It was said that the last shots of the war were fired by a troop of King Edward's Horse, who were proceeding to capture a field-gun a few minutes before 11 o'clock. They shot two of the gun crew and were about to rush the gun, when the officer in charge, watch in hand, stopped the operation, for it was 11 o'clock.

The terms of the armistice, which are given in full elsewhere,¹ stipulated for the immediate evacuation of the invaded territories—Belgium, France, Luxemburg, and (be it noted) Alsace-Lorraine—and for the surrender by the Germans of 5,000 guns (2,500 heavy and 2,500 field), 30,000 machine-guns, 3,000 flame-throwers, and 2,000 aeroplanes. Further, all Germany west of the Rhine was to be evacuated in thirty-one days, and the principal bridge-heads, at Mainz, Coblenz, and Cologne, were to be occupied by the Associated Powers. The naval conditions included the surrender of all submarines, fifty destroyers, eight light cruisers, six battle-cruisers, and ten battleships. The duration of the armistice was to be thirty-six days, but provision was made for possible (and probable) extension.

It will be seen that the terms imposed were tantamount to complete surrender. The victory was complete. Germany was defeated and surrendered. It was true, however, that the surrender was not quite unconditional. The German Government did not in any sense enter into negotiations as equals, they surrendered; but they surrendered, not unconditionally,

¹ See "Public Documents".

but to certain terms—President Wilson's Fourteen Points, with two qualifications. It is virtually certain that the Allies could have enforced unconditional surrender within a few months, probably within a few weeks, but in point of fact they did not deem it necessary to incur the extra sacrifice of life, since it was considered that the terms which Germany was already willing to accept, the Wilson policy, provided the foundation for a just and enduring peace.

The conditions of the armistice were carried out in a quiet and orderly manner. The British occupied Cologne and Bonn, the Americans were stationed in Coblenz, and the French took over Mainz. The British occupied the furthest points, the Cologne bridge-head, on December 12, the river being formally crossed on that day. On the following day the Americans crossed the Rhine at Coblenz.

The German warships were surrendered in batches, the first ships leaving the German ports for that purpose on November 20, and the remainder following during the next few days. The submarines surrendered off Harwich. The surface warships surrendered in the Forth, and were then sent to Scapa Flow, where they were to remain until the treaty of peace decided their final fate.

After the termination of hostilities certain provisional statistics of casualties were published. The total British (including Dominion and Indian) military casualties were given provisionally as 3,050,000. The total of "killed" reported up to November 10 was 658,704, but many soldiers reported "missing" were no doubt killed.

The Admiralty report of total casualties was stated to be complete. It was as follows:—

| | Dead. | Wounded. | Missing. | Prisoners. | Total. |
|------------------|--------|----------|----------|------------|--------|
| Officers - - - - | 2,466 | 805 | 15 | 222 | 3,508 |
| Men - - - - | 30,895 | 4,378 | 32 | 953 | 36,258 |
| Totals - - - - | 33,361 | 5,183 | 47 | 1,175 | 39,766 |

These totals included a certain number of merchant seamen serving temporarily in a naval capacity. In addition, no fewer than 14,661 officers and men of the mercantile marine lost their lives through enemy action whilst following their ordinary vocations, and 3,295 were captured and held as prisoners of war.

A provisional estimate of German casualties published in December stated that the dead numbered 1,600,000 and the total casualties 6,385,000. The number of wounded was given as over 4,000,000.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

A STORMY WINTER.

ON January 1 the Prime Minister issued the following New Year message to the nation :—

“At the beginning of a New Year the message I should like to send to all at home is an appeal to do their utmost in these later trying days for the cause for which the democracies of the world are now leagued together.

“The sacrifices which the men—and the women also—are making at the front we all know. Despite all that they have gone through, they are still facing frost and mud, privation and suffering, wounds and death, with undaunted courage that mankind may be freed from the tyranny of militarism and rejoice in lasting freedom and peace. No sacrifice that we who stay at home are called to make can equal or faintly approach what is daily and hourly demanded of them. So long as they are called upon to endure these things let us see to it that we do not take our ease at the price of their sacrifice.

“There is nobody too old or too young or too feeble to play a part. If we cannot fight in person, we can fight by the vigour and good will by which we do our work, the wisdom of our economy, the generosity with which we meet the nation's financial needs.

“At the moment lending and saving are specially important. Money is essential to victory, and economy is the condition of financial power. It is therefore the duty of all to save what they can and to lend what they can to the community at this time. Every man, woman, and child ought to make it a point of honour to increase his holding of National War Bonds as the year goes by, bonds which have behind them the whole strength and credit and resources of Britain itself.

“To every civilian, therefore, I would say: ‘Your firing-line is the works or the office in which you do your bit; the shop or the kitchen in which you spend or save; the bank or the post-office in which you buy your bonds’. To reach that firing-line and to become an active combatant yourself there are no communication trenches to grope along, no barrage to face, no horrors, no wounds. The road of duty and patriotism

is clear before you ; follow it, and it will lead ere long to safety for our people and victory for our cause.

“D. LLOYD GEORGE.”

The appeal was timely, for the year had opened badly. The war had brought disappointments, and at home a number of causes tended to add to the depression. January registered extreme cold and stormy weather. The temperature in the Thames valley was the lowest on record for years. There were violent gales at sea, rivers were frozen and then flooded the surrounding country so that traffic was impeded and crops damaged. There were also two hostile air-raids during the month ; in the one, on the night of the 28th to the 29th, 58 people were officially given as killed, and 173 as injured ; in the other, on the night of the 29th to the 30th, there were 10 killed and 10 injured. To complete the record, on January 12 a mine explosion occurred in North Staffordshire, one of the most disastrous in the annals of the local coalfield, at the Minnie Pit of the Podmore Hall Colliery, Halmerend. The death roll was 160.

The general depression was heightened by the unsatisfactory food situation. There was a scarcity of most foodstuffs, and food queues were reported from all parts of the country. Meat in particular was short, the dearth being caused by the killing of stock because of the scarcity of feeding-stuffs. It was no uncommon thing to find butchers' shops closed. The protest uttered by the Labour Party Conference at Nottingham (Jan. 25) against the difficult food situation only expressed the feelings of the working classes, who in several localities organised orderly demonstrations against queues and profiteering. Thus at Manchester about 100,000 workers marched to the Town Hall to express their dissatisfaction (Jan. 17).

The Ministry of Food was active in its attempts to improve the situation. An order was issued (Jan. 23) limiting the quantity of staple foods, such as meats and fats, which might be consumed by visitors in hotels and by all people taking casual public meals, the prices of fish, of mutton, and of marmalade were fixed, and the food ration of the men in the army whose duties approximated to those performed by the civilian population was reduced by the Army Council. It became more and more evident, however, that compulsory rationing for the whole population would be inevitable, though on the whole the system of voluntary rations hitherto advocated had worked well. According to this system the ration per head per day in each household was as follows : (1) Bread, for men on heavy work, 1 lb. 2½ oz. ; for men on manual work, 1 lb. ; for men on sedentary work, 10½ oz. ; for women, from 8 to 11 oz. (2) Cereals other than bread, 1½ oz. (3) Meat, 4½ oz. (4) Butter, margarine, and other fats, 5 oz. (5) Sugar, 1½ oz.

The first experiment in rationing was made with meat. On February 25 meat tickets (reproduced below) came into force

in London and the Home Counties, and the official announcement which offered some explanations of the scheme was in the following terms:—

“The Food Controller has decided to adopt for the rationing of butchers’ meat, under the London and Home Counties scheme, the principle of fixing the ration by monetary value, while keeping to a weight basis for other meat and for meat meals. This proposal has been approved by the Consumers’ Council and by representatives of the trade concerned.

LONDON MEAT CARD.

| LONDON AND HOME COUNTIES. (See Instructions overleaf.) | | | | | Meat Card D 7. | | |
|---|----|----------------------------------|----|----|---------------------------------------|----|----|
| Butcher's Name _____ | | | | | GIVE THIS PART TO YOUR BUTCHER. | | |
| Butcher's Address _____ | | | | | | | |
| 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| 20 | 20 | MEAT CARD [L. and H.C.]. | | | | 15 | 15 |
| | | Office of Issue _____ | | | | | |
| 20 | 20 | A. Holder's Name — | | | | 15 | 15 |
| | | Address:— | | | | | |
| 19 | 19 | _____ | | | | 16 | 16 |
| 19 | 19 | B Holder's Signature — | | | | 16 | 16 |
| 18 | 18 | C. Butcher's Name and Address. — | | | | 17 | 17 |
| | | _____ | | | | | |
| 18 | 18 | IF FOUND, DROP IN A PILLAR BOX. | | | | 17 | 17 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

“Each coupon on the adult meat card will represent five pennyworth of uncooked butchers’ meat, including pork and offal, or a weight of other meat according to an official schedule of equivalent weights.

“Not more than three out of four coupons may, as a rule, be used for the purchase of uncooked butchers’ meat in each week.

The weekly ration of butchers' meat will accordingly be 1s. 3d. worth.

"Each holder of a card will be able to use any of the coupons for the purchase of other kinds of meat (bacon, ham, poultry, game, rabbits, preserved and prepared meats, etc.) up to the amounts fixed by the schedule of equivalent weights. The schedule will be published at the beginning of next week. The weights of the other meat are fixed so as to correspond substantially with 5 oz. of uncooked butchers' meat with average bone.

"Coupons may also be used for the purpose of meat meals.

"The general result is to make the weekly adult ration 1s. 3d. worth of butchers' meat together with other meat equivalent to 5 oz. of butchers' meat.

"Each coupon of a child's meat card will represent half the value of an adult's coupon."

On February 25 there also came into operation the scheme for butter and margarine rationing in London whereby 4 oz. of butter or margarine was the amount allowed each person per week.

These measures tended to allay the discontent connected with the food situation. No less difficult was the question of man-power, one of the first problems with which the House of Commons dealt on its re-assembly on January 14, after the Christmas recess. Sir Auckland Geddes, the Minister of National Service, introduced a Bill the chief effect of which was to call up from civil employment a number of young men who had hitherto been exempt from military service. Sir Auckland announced that it was necessary to raise immediately in this country 420,000 to 450,000 men from among those now in civil life. The Bill had two main objects—to abolish the automatic addition of two months' exemption then enjoyed by certain men, and to give the Director-General of National Service power to withdraw any certificates of exemption granted on occupational grounds.

On the whole the Trade Unions showed signs of co-operating with the Government in carrying out the proposals of the scheme. Only the Amalgamated Society of Engineers stood aloof, stubbornly refusing to act in the matter in association with any other trade union in the engineering trade except on the basis of amalgamation or absorption of that union.

On January 17, during the debate on the second reading of the Military Service Bill, while Mr. Hogge was speaking, Mr. Pringle "spied strangers," and the House went into secret session for the seventh time during the war (April 25 and 26, 1916; May 10 and 11, 1917; June 9, 1917; Déc. 13, 1917; and Jan. 17, 1918).

The Act was passed and received the Royal Assent on February 6, 1918, and the Trade Unions representing war industries, including the Amalgamated Society of Engineers,

ultimately agreed to co-operate in making the working of the Act effective. Important as this measure was, its significance can hardly compare with the Reform Act, perhaps the largest effort of the Third War Session of Parliament, which came to an end on February 6. The main provisions of the new Reform Act were as follows:—

1. FRANCHISES.

Men.—Qualifications for a vote: Twenty-one years of age, and six months' residence or occupation of business premises.

Women.—Qualifications for a vote: Thirty years of age, and either a local government elector or the wife of one. (The qualification for the local government franchise is six months' ownership or tenancy of land or premises. Lodgers in furnished rooms are not qualified.)

University.—The qualification for this franchise is the attainment by a man or woman within the above age-limits of a definite standard, which in England and Wales is the taking of a degree. A woman is also qualified to vote for a university which does not admit women to degrees if she has fulfilled the conditions for the admission of a man to a degree.

War Service.—Naval and military voters to be registered for the constituencies for which they would have been qualified but for their service. This provision applies to (1) sailors and soldiers on full pay, and (2) merchant seamen, pilots, and fishermen, and persons engaged on Red Cross work or other work of national importance abroad or afloat. Male voters who have served in the war will be qualified at the age of 19 years.

Dual Voting.—No person to vote at a General Election for more than two constituencies.

Disqualifications.—Conscientious objectors to be disqualified during the war and for five years afterwards, unless they satisfy the Central Tribunal that they have fulfilled certain conditions, such as employment in work of national importance. Only British subjects to be qualified. The receipt of poor relief to be no longer a disqualification.

2. REGISTRATION.

Registers of Electors.—Two to be prepared in every year—one in the spring and one in the autumn.

Registration Areas and Officers.—Each Parliamentary borough and county to be a registration area, with the town clerk of the borough and the clerk of the county council respectively as registration officer.

Appeals.—If from a decision of a registration officer, to lie to the County Court. A further appeal on any point of law to lie to the Court of Appeal, whose decision is to be final.

Registration Expenses.—Half to be paid out of local rates and half by the State.

3. METHOD OF ELECTIONS.

Proportional Representation.—To be applied to university constituencies returning two or more members; 11 seats

affected. Commissioners to prepare a scheme for the election of 100 town and country members in Great Britain by "P.R.," to take effect if approved by resolution of both Houses.

General Election.—All polls to be held on one day. Nomination day to be the same in all constituencies.

Absent Voters.—Separate lists to be prepared. Ballot papers to be sent to absent voters, marked by them, and returned with a declaration of identity.

Voting by Proxy.—To be permitted in the case of naval and military voters in distant areas, and merchant seamen, pilots, and fishermen at sea.

4. COSTS OF ELECTIONS.

Candidates' Deposits.—Fixed at 150*l.* To be forfeited if the number of votes polled by a candidate does not exceed one-eighth of the total number polled. To be returned in any other case.

Returning Officers' Expenses.—To be paid by the Treasury.

Scale of Election Expenses.—Maximum to be 7*d.* for each elector in a county constituency and 5*d.* in a borough.

Unauthorised Expenses.—No person, unless authorised by the election agent of a candidate, to incur any expenses by holding meetings or issuing advertisements or circulars to promote the election of any candidate.

5. REDISTRIBUTION.

Basis.—One member for every 70,000 of population in Great Britain; one for every 43,000 in Ireland (by separate Bill).

London Boroughs.—62 members, a gain of 3.

Other Boroughs.—258 members (33 more). Forty-four old boroughs extinguished; 31 new boroughs created, including 13 (returning 18 members) in Greater London and 8 in Lancashire.

Counties.—372 members (5 less). Changes chiefly in boundaries of divisions.

Universities.—15 members (6 more). Representation extended to the new universities.

Membership of House.—England, 492 (31 more); Wales, 36 (2 more); Scotland, 74 (2 more); Ireland, 105 (2 more). Total, 707.

In order to estimate the scope of the new Act it may be stated that while the Reform Act of 1832 enfranchised 500,000 new voters, that of 1867, 1,000,000 new voters, and that of 1884, 2,000,000 new voters, the Act of 1918 enfranchised 8,000,000 new voters, 6,000,000 being women, of whom 5,000,000 were married, and 2,000,000 being men. The clause in the Bill which enfranchised women was passed by the House of Lords by 134 votes to 71—a majority of sixty-three (Jan. 10). A particularly powerful plea for woman suffrage was made by Lord Selborne, who declared that the enfranchisement of women would bring strength and fresh power to the country and the Empire. The Archbishop of Canterbury also strongly supported

the women's claim, urging that to pass the clause would be but to recognise the part that women were taking in the national life.

While there was no controversy between the Lords and the Commons on woman suffrage, the other matter of importance in the new Reform Bill, *viz.*, proportional representation, was the subject of some disagreement, and ultimately of a compromise, between the two Houses. The House of Commons had three times rejected proportional representation; in the House of Lords, Lord Selborne's amendment to the Bill, applying a complete scheme of proportional representation to the whole country, was adopted by 132 votes to 42—a majority of ninety. But the Commons rejected the Lords' amendment by a majority of 110. In the end the differences between the two Houses were adjusted by a compromise, providing for the appointment of Commissioners to frame a scheme for the election of 100 members by Proportional Representation which should take effect if adopted by resolution of both Houses.

The legislation of the session included further (1) the Corn Production Act, the provisions of which formed a vital part of the national policy of increasing food production at home. The Act fixed minimum prices for wheat and oats for six years, guaranteed a minimum wage to agricultural workmen; and empowered the Board of Agriculture to enforce proper cultivation. (2) The Air Force Act, which constituted a new Service under a fully equipped ministry with a Secretary of State at its head. (3) The Non-ferrous Metal Industry Bill, which was framed to eliminate enemy influence from the control of a "key" industry.

During the session votes of credit amounting in the aggregate to 2,710,000,000*l.* were voted by the House of Commons. The enormous growth of the national expenditure during the war moved the Commons to agree, at the instigation of Colonel Godfrey Collins, to appoint a Select Committee on National Expenditure with Mr. Herbert Samuel as Chairman. At the debate on the reports already presented by the Committee, on January 29, Mr. Herbert Samuel suggested the re-appointment of the Committee next session to continue its inquiries. He pointed out that, while the Committee had made proposals for economy in various directions, further increases of expenditure were continually proceeding in other directions, and instanced the following increases which had taken place since August, 1917: the 9*d.* loaf, 45,000,000*l.*; bonus to potato growers, 5,000,000*l.*; increase in soldiers' pay, 65,000,000*l.*; increase in officers' pay, over 7,000,000*l.*; bonus to miners, 20,000,000*l.*; bonus to munition workers, 40,000,000*l.*; bonus to railway men, 10,000,000*l.*; and bonus to civil servants, 3,000,000*l.* In view of these increases, Mr. Samuel appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to put a brake on the growth of national expenditure. Mr. Bonar Law in his reply declared he had every

reason to hope that the total expenditure under votes of credit at the end of the financial year would not be nearly so large as at one time there was reason to expect.

The King's speech at the prorogation of Parliament was in the following terms:—

THE KING'S SPEECH.

“ My Lords and Gentlemen,

“ Since last I addressed you great events have happened. Within a few weeks of that occasion, the United States of America decided to take their stand by the side of this Country and our Allies in defence of the principles of Liberty and Justice. Their entry into the War, followed by that of other neutral States, has united practically the whole civilised world in a League of Nations against unscrupulous aggression, has lent additional strength to Our arms, and inspires fresh confidence in the ultimate triumph of Our cause.

“ On the other hand, Russia, distracted by internal dissensions, has not been able to persevere in the struggle until the fruits of her great sacrifices could have been reaped: and for the present has ceased to bear her part in the Allied task. The negotiations opened by her with the enemy have, however, served but to prove that the ambitions which provoked this unhappy War are as yet unabated.

“ These tragic events have added to the burdens of the other Allies, but have not impaired the vigour and the loyalty with which one and all continue to pursue the common aim. Amid the confusion of changing events the determination of the democracies of the world to secure a just and enduring peace stands out ever more clearly.

“ In all the theatres of war, My Naval and Military Forces have displayed throughout the year a noble courage, a high constancy, and a fixed determination, which have won for them the admiration of My people. In France, the enemy has been repeatedly and successfully thrown back, and I await with assurance the further progress of the conflict. In Palestine and Mesopotamia the most revered and famous cities of the Orient have been wrested from the Turk; while in Africa the enemy has lost the last remnant of his Colonial possessions. In all these fields, the forces of My Dominions and of the Indian Empire have borne their full share in the toil and in the glory of the day.

“ During the year the representatives of My Dominions and of the Indian Empire were summoned for the first time to the sessions of an Imperial War Cabinet.

“ Their deliberations have been of the utmost value, both in the prosecution of the War and in the promotion of Imperial Unity.

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons,

"I thank you for the liberality with which you have provided for the heavy expenditure of the War.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,

"I have been pleased to give My consent to your proposals for the better Representation of the People. I trust that this measure will ensure to a much larger number of My subjects in the United Kingdom an effective voice in the government of the country, and will enable the National Unity, which has been so marked a characteristic of the War, to continue in the not less arduous work of reconstruction in times of peace.

"The settlement of this difficult question by agreement leads me still to hope that, in spite of all the complexities of the problem, a solution may be possible in regard to the government of Ireland, upon which a Convention of representatives of My Irish people is now deliberating.

"The successful prosecution of the War is still our first aim and endeavour. I have watched with a proud and grateful heart the unvarying enthusiasm with which all sections of My people have responded to every demand made upon them for this purpose, and, as they face the final tests which may yet be required to carry our efforts to fruition, I pray that Almighty God may vouchsafe to us His Blessing."

A number of developments in the sphere of commerce remain to be noted. The tendency towards banking fusions, already exemplified late in 1917 by the amalgamation of (1) the London and South-Western and the London and Provincial Banks, and (2) the National Provincial Bank of England and the Union of London and Smith's Bank, received a further impetus by the announcement made on February 2 that an agreement had been entered into between (3) the Boards of the London County and Westminster Bank and Parr's Bank, for the amalgamation as from January 1, 1918, of the two businesses under the title of London County Westminster and Parr's Bank, Ltd. Scarcely had the Treasury sanctioned (Feb. 16) the necessary issue of new capital in connexion with this scheme than the fourth amalgamation was announced (Feb. 18) between the London City and Midland Bank and the London Joint Stock Bank. The tendency attracted some public attention, and on February 5, the Chancellor of the Exchequer promised that a committee would be appointed "to consider and report to what extent it is desirable, in the public interest, to interfere with such arrangements."

In view of the much greater demands which were expected to be made on the Board of Trade by the business interests of the country after the war, the department was reorganised (Jan. 17) into two main sections (1) the Department of Commerce and Industry and (2) the Department of Public Services Administration. The former will be mainly concerned with the

development of trade, with vigilance, with suggestion, with information, and with the duty of thinking out and assisting national commercial and industrial policy. The Department of Public Services Administration will be primarily engaged in the exercise of statutory and other administrative functions of a permanent nature with regard to trade and transport now or in the future entrusted to the Board of Trade. It will therefore include the work performed by the present Marine, Railway, Harbour, Companies and Bankruptcy departments. Another step in the same direction was the appointment of a number of Trade Commissioners to various centres in the Empire.

If these measures were adopted in the interests of commerce, others were taken to promote industry. In particular, two may be mentioned—the production of mineral oil from home sources, and the revival of flax growing. The Ministry of Munitions had already taken steps to obtain oil in this country. A good deal of shale oil had been produced in Scotland, but the attempts to produce it in various parts of England had not been so successful. Oil can be obtained in larger quantities, however, from coal, especially cannel, by low temperature carbonisation. Low temperature retorts had not, up to that time, been worked commercially, but development in this direction was hoped for. Further progress had also been made for extracting oil in satisfactory quantities from materials which up to then had been regarded practically as waste; in fact, it was expected that munition factories would be using this home oil within the next few months. Experiments had been made in boring by private companies, but not by the Government, although plant was being prepared for that purpose. The Government, however, (April 10) appointed a Committee of Inquiry into the matter. For the production of flax the Board of Agriculture set up a Special Branch, and the Government decided to get 10,000 acres of flax sown during the Spring.

Summer time began on the morning of Sunday, March 24, somewhat earlier than last year, and continued to Sunday, September 29, a period of twenty-six weeks. Great as was the saving of coal by this extension of daylight, it was not sufficient in itself and had to be augmented by the so-called Curfew Order which was announced in the House of Commons by Sir Albert Stanley, President of the Board of Trade, on March 20. The regulations provided that no lights should be used for the purpose of illuminating shop windows; no food was to be cooked or hot meals served in any hotel, club, inn, restaurant, or boarding-house between 9.30 at night and 5 in the morning; all lights in the dining-rooms of those places were to be put out at 10 o'clock at night; and no performances in theatres, music-halls, cinemas, or other places of amusement might be continued after 10.30 at night. Restricted tramway and railway services, which came into force on April 1, would also, it was held, contribute to the reduction in the consumption of coal. The other principal

provision of the Order was the rationing of gas and electric light, and was confined to the City and County of London and the counties of Middlesex, Kent, Surrey, Sussex, Hertford, Huntingdon, Cambridge and the Isle of Ely, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Northampton and the Soke of Peterborough, Bedford, Buckingham, Oxford, Berks, Gloucester, Hants and the Isle of Wight, Wilts, Dorset, Somerset, Devon, and Cornwall. Throughout this area, except in cases where the then consumption fell below a very low specified figure, no person in any one quarter of the year was to consume on any premises of which he was the occupier more than five-sixths of the amount of gas or electricity used during the corresponding quarter of the year 1916 or 1917.

The general meat rationing scheme which was postponed from March 25 to April 7 was found to work smoothly. It provided in addition to the ordinary rations, supplementary rations for "heavy" workers who were classed either as men on very heavy industrial work, men on heavy agricultural work, or men on heavy industrial work. The full ration was also allowed to all children over six, and a supplementary ration of 5 oz. of bacon with bone, or its equivalent in other meat, to growing boys between thirteen and eighteen. On the other hand, the weekly meat ration was reduced, as from May 5, to two coupons only. The price of cheese was fixed by a Food Order which came into force on April 1; the wholesale price of fish was fixed anew, and a special effort was made to extend the potato acreage, which was regarded as of such great importance that the Prime Minister issued the following appeal, on March 18, to farmers and others:—

"I desire to impress upon all farmers and small growers the vital importance of increasing to the utmost extent possible the supply of potatoes this year.

"There is no crop under existing war conditions which can compare with it in importance as a food for either man or beast, and it would be quite impossible to plant too many potatoes this spring.

"Last year I appealed to the farmer to grow more potatoes, and he responded by beating all records. This year I appeal again, and with even greater earnestness, because the need is twice as great.

"If we can get a million acres under potatoes in Great Britain this year, the food situation will be safe and farmers will have rendered an immense service to their country.

"The potato-grower is in the front line of the fight against the submarine. He can defeat it if he chooses, but victory depends on his action and exertions during the next few weeks.

"D. LLOYD GEORGE."

The appeal to farmers was paralleled by the appeal to Business men to raise 100,000,000*l.* by the sale of War Bonds in a week. The campaign was opened on March 4, after Mr. Bonar

Law, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had given it a send-off at a luncheon of the Aldwych Club on February 26. Mr. Law explained that the system of week by week lending was the best alternative to another Loan; that such weekly investments necessitated no dislocation of business and provided a constant stream of money for the Government; and that they hoped in that one week to obtain a margin which should make it quite certain that whatever comes in subsequent weeks will be sufficient to meet the need of the War expenditure. The "Business Men's Week" was also blessed by the King who expressed his confidence that the people would contribute whatever money was required for victory. That confidence was not misplaced; the "Business Men's Week" yielded a total of 138,870,240*l.*, made up as follows: National War Bonds, Bank of England series, 127,870,240*l.*; Sale at Post Offices, 2,900,000*l.*; War Savings Certificates, 8,100,000*l.* Of the total amount, 75,000,000*l.* was contributed by London.

No less popular was the scheme for the formation of a historic Red Cross Pearl Necklace, to be sold eventually for the benefit of the sick and wounded. The scheme was inaugurated on March 12 at the first meeting of the General Committee, of which Her Royal Highness Princess Victoria held the Chairmanship, and ladies all over the country began contributing pearls for the Necklace.

The new Session of Parliament opened on February 12. The King's speech, following so soon upon the message from His Majesty with which the old session ended was necessarily brief, its burden being that "until a recognition is offered of the only principles on which an honourable peace can be concluded, it is our duty to prosecute the war with all the vigour that we possess." In the Debate on the Address the House was worked up to an excited state on the question of the Supreme War Council at Versailles. Mr. Asquith raised the matter by asking for information about military leadership. In view of the many disquieting rumours he thought that the Government would be well advised to tell the House what was the enlargement of the functions of the Supreme War Council, and whether in particular it had assumed executive powers. The Prime Minister rose at once to reply. Mr. Lloyd George assured the House that it was impossible to make a statement about the Versailles decisions without giving information to the enemy about the plans of the Allies. The elimination of Russia as an effective force on the side of the Allies and the consequent strengthening of the enemy position in the West had brought about a completely changed situation. This new problem had been faced at Versailles, but while he could give no information that would imperil the Army, he assured the House that the decision to extend the powers of the Council was adopted unanimously by the military as well as the civil representatives of the Allied Powers.

On the following day the excitement of the first day of the

session died down, though the Government were subjected to a good deal of criticism. Mr. Herbert Samuel opened the sitting with a critical review of the domestic policies of the War Cabinet, dwelling particularly on the failure of the Government to attain the high standard they had set themselves in the departments of man-power, food production, finance and shipbuilding. Mr. Bonar Law took up the challenge and contested Mr. Samuel's argument point by point. In regard to man-power, Mr. Law pointed out that in 1917 the Government had put into the army 820,645 additional men ; that in regard to food production 1,000,000 more acres had been brought under the plough, producing an additional 850,000 tons of cereals and 3,000,000 tons of potatoes ; that as for shipbuilding, while in 1916 only 539,000 tons had been built, in 1917 the tonnage was 1,163,474 tons. Mr. Samuel's case, Mr. Law pointed out, was tantamount to a condemnation of the Government, and it was his duty therefore to put into power a Government in whom he had more confidence. Mr. Law, however, admitted that the Government were tired. Mr. Adamson, the leader of the Labour Party, nevertheless held that before any change was made the country ought to be convinced that the existing Government would be succeeded by a better.

The third day of the Debate on the Address was in the main an attack on the food policy of the Government. Mr. Lough challenged the entire policy of the Food Controller with an amendment regretting that continuous Orders in Council, interfering with the regular course of trade, had diminished importation and production and had increased distress. He asked the House to believe that, if the law were not broken every day and its violation winked at, we should all be starving. He charged the Ministry with taking the most ingenious steps they could to create famine in the land, and counselled the House to pay heed to the early mutterings of the storm of revolution. Opposition to the amendment came from Major Tryon, who contended that, without the rationing orders, it was impossible to secure a proper distribution of food. But the general trend of the debate was decidedly hostile to the Food Controller. Colonel Meysey-Thompson spoke of his "meddling and muddling," and attributed the existing scarcity of meat and milk entirely to the Food Controller. Major Wood suggested that the cost of production to the grower should be taken as the basis for fixing controlled prices, it being made plain that, if it led to prices being too high, the general taxpayer would be called upon to bring articles of food within the reach of the poorer classes.

Mr. Prothero, the first Government spokesman, pointed out the difficulty and delicacy of the task of the Food Controller, "this most unfortunate of Ministers." He submitted a powerful argument in defence of his policy of ploughing up more grass land. Suppose, he said, we were able to raise 1,000,000 more tons of grain from the ploughed-up land. To import that

amount we should want 360 ships each of 5,000 tons carrying capacity. Suppose, however, the land had been left under grass. It would have produced 75,000 tons of meat, which could be imported in 40 ships of the same capacity. The question of food supplies, Mr. Prothero warned the House, was the gravest which the country had to face. He reminded members that the Government were asking landowners to sacrifice some of the capital value of their land, and farmers who had led easy lives to exchange grass-growing for increased arable farming, with its added risks and responsibilities. He found that they had accepted risks and losses almost universally in a most patriotic spirit, and he believed that farmers were working as they had never worked before.

Mr. Clynes likewise emphasised the seriousness of the food position and gravely warned the civil population that people had reached the point where their patriotism and endurance were to be tested. The civilian would have to go short of some articles of food ; in fact, he would have to submit to what he had asked should be imposed on him. He hoped to succeed in convincing even the poorest people that they were going to have an equal chance with their richer brethren, and that men, women, and children, and not money, must be the consideration that would determine the apportionment of food. As for the stream of Orders, they were the necessary expression of the multitude of the problems with which the Food Ministry had to deal. In the realm of achievement, he pointed to the fact that the Government had taken the place of the merchant and importer. Further, they were dealing with other Governments, and were saving an enormous amount of money to the consumer and preventing prices from going up merely because of the existing scarcity. He denied that supplies from Scandinavia had been checked by our maximum prices, and announced that the Department was about to offer tea at a retail flat rate of 2s. 8d. a pound.

The powers of the Versailles Council came up for discussion once more in the debate on Tuesday, February 19, on the Army estimates for the year ending March 31, 1919, especially as on Saturday (February 16) it was officially announced that General Sir William Robertson had ceased to be Chief of the Imperial General Staff. The Prime Minister gave a detailed account of the changes recently made at the Versailles Council together with the arguments which induced the Allied Governments to extend the scope of their original plan. The new plan, so far as the military leaders of this country were concerned, laid down two points :—

1. The British Permanent Military Adviser at Versailles to become a member of the Army Council. He was to be in constant communication with the Chief of the Imperial General Staff, but he was to be absolutely free and unfettered in the advice he gave as a member of the Board of Military Representatives at

Versailles. He was to have the powers necessary to enable him to fulfil the duties imposed upon him by the recent Versailles decision.

2. The Chief of the Imperial General Staff was to hold office under the same conditions and with the same powers as every Chief of the Imperial General Staff up to the appointment of General Robertson, remaining the supreme military adviser of the British Government. He was to accompany Ministers to the meetings of the Supreme War Council as their adviser, and was to have the right of visiting France for the purpose of consulting with any or all of the military representatives of the Supreme War Council.

After declaring that there was no derogation of the power of the Government, the Prime Minister explained that it was only when the Government decided to offer the Versailles position to Sir William Robertson that he realised that he took an objection to the system not on technical or constitutional, but on military grounds. Sir William Robertson suggested a modification of the proposal by making the representative at Versailles a deputy of the Chief of the Staff, but the Government felt bound to reject it. He did his best to urge Sir William Robertson to take one or other of these positions, and declared emphatically that they parted with expressions of great kindness. Mr. Lloyd George ended his review by appealing to the House to close its ranks in face of the terrible realities of the time, and insisted that the Government were entitled to know at once whether Parliament wished them to proceed upon a policy deliberately framed to organise our forces to meet the onset of the foe.

Mr. Asquith followed with the suggestion that discrepancies existed between the Prime Minister's statements last week and that day, and proceeded to ask sceptical questions about Sir William Robertson's attitude to the plan before his resignation. Was it not the fact that Sir William Robertson had intimated that he could not assent to the proposals, before the Prime Minister made his first speech? The Prime Minister and Mr. Bonar Law both shook their heads. Mr. Asquith then asked if at that time Sir Henry Wilson had not been sent for to succeed to Sir William Robertson's place. Mr. Asquith proceeded to argue the case for making the British representative at Versailles responsible to the Chief of the Staff, and declared that the Government had taken a very great responsibility in disregarding the opinion of their strategical and technical authority.

Mr. Austen Chamberlain who followed expressed the satisfaction of the House with the Prime Minister's speech, but urged that it would have been better if he had taken members more fully into his confidence a week ago. He suggested that much of the Prime Minister's trouble lay in his supposed relations with the Press, and contended that his Government had surrounded themselves quite unnecessarily with an atmosphere

of suspicion and distrust by associating three great newspaper proprietors with the Administration.

Mr. Chamberlain returned to this subject at a later stage in the session. Meanwhile the Prime Minister's speech appeared to have allayed the excitement both in the House and the country in regard to the Versailles Council, and when on February 20 Mr. Macpherson, the Under-Secretary for War, introduced the Army estimates for 1918-19, a calm atmosphere once again prevailed in the Commons. The greater part of Mr. Macpherson's speech was statistical and may be best summarised under the following heads:—

War Office Purchases.

Total.—270,000,000*l.* of manufactured goods (including 26,000,000*l.* for the Allies) and 113,000,000*l.* of raw materials.

Food.—Preserved meat, 12,000,000*l.* (representing 270,000,000 rations); tea, 84,000,000 lb.; sugar, 177,000,000 lb.; milk, 145,000,000 tins.

Tobacco.—Pipe and chewing tobacco, 8,500,000 lb.; cigarettes, 11,000,000 lb.

Wool and Textiles.—Over 250,000,000 yards of material a year. Expenditure on wool alone, 88,000,000*l.*

Medical.—Bandages, 67,000,000; quinine, 2,000,000 oz.; tetanus anti-toxin, 1,250,000 oz.; and cotton-wool, 4,700,000 lb.

Saving of Tonnage.

Total saving in the coming year, 2,000,000 tons.

Wood-pulp had been substituted for tin-plates for packing food supplies for the Armies.

Crude glycerine at the annual rate of 1,800 tons had been recovered from by-products alone, and sold to the Ministry of Munitions for the manufacture of 18,000,000 shells.

In Mesopotamia there were 1,000 square miles under cultivation.

Egypt was self-supporting in sugar, potatoes, and other fresh vegetables.

Transport.

During the past year nearly 7,000,000 men, 500,000 animals, over 200,000 vehicles, and over 9,500,000 tons of stores had been taken to the fronts.

In Mesopotamia the river fleet had been increased by 700 craft, and about 1,000 miles of waterways were in operation.

Over 1,000,000 men and a large quantity of stores were conveyed by water, and the traffic amounted to 230,000,000 tons.

Personnel.

Commissions published during the last ten months for officers, 48,452; warrants for warrant officers, 6,435.

the war. At that time he was in business, and had every opportunity of seeing the beginning of an orgy of extravagance which it had taken the serious efforts of the Government for the last two years to grapple with. Indeed, it was an open question for some time whether the Government or the extravagance would come out on top. Turning to the budget proposals, he freely admitted that the luxury tax would not have occurred to a professional economist. He urged that the Government were justified in asking a Select Committee to investigate the possibilities of the tax, inasmuch as they had a great deal of popular opinion behind them.

Mr. Sydney Arnold demanded a levy on capital to meet a large part of our war liabilities. He proposed a levy in two instalments, one at the end of the war and the second two years later, each of an average yield of 12 per cent. on individuals in the manner of the death duties on a graduated scale.

This programme was vigorously combated by Mr. Theodore Taylor, who contended that the effect of taking slices of a living man's capital was simply to take the heart out of him. He regarded the taxation of capital as neither right nor practicable.

Mr. Illingworth, the Postmaster-General, joined in the debate with a brief reply to criticism of the new postal rates. He justified the increases in the letter and post-card rates on the ground that the Post Office was at present barely self-supporting. He asked the House to recognise that the user ought to pay the expenses of the Post Office, and insisted that the increased rates were an unfortunate necessity.

The debate turned for a time on the new position of the farmer. Mr. Turton expressed the belief that farmers would look upon their treatment in the budget as unjust.

In his reply Mr. Bonar Law acknowledged that on the whole the budget had been well received. Dealing first with the new tax on the farmer, he explained that, apart altogether from the money to be obtained, there was evidence which could not be overlooked that farmers were not paying their full share of the burden imposed upon the nation by the war. He denied that farmers were being hardly used, and declared that, if his treatment of them was compared with that of other classes, they certainly could not complain. Mr. Bonar Law told the House frankly that he would be reluctant to give up any of the taxes now in the budget. He had heard criticism of his proposal for doubling the stamp on cheques, but he had consulted beforehand representative bankers, and elicited their opinion that the change would be accepted readily and would not cause great inconvenience. That was his belief too, and he hoped the House would allow the tax to go through. "After all," he reminded the House, "a million is a million." As for the increase in the postal rates, that was a change which had been accepted in every other country. He defended the new sugar duty as fair, and pointed to the fact that a man with a wife and

that, except for what was necessary for the conduct of the war, everything gave way to the food supply.

Replying to criticism in the House of Commons, Mr. Clynes paid a tribute to Lord Rhondda's courage and self-sacrifice, and declared that he had no intention of resigning as a means of escape from his difficulties. He acknowledged the indebtedness of the Food Ministry to the Press, as, without their help, its work could not be effectively carried out. He replied to much detailed criticism of the rationing scheme, and observed that it was better to see a person in difficulties over the food tickets inside a butcher's shop than in a queue outside. He gave an assurance that, if the Ministry could overcome certain obvious objections, manual workers would receive larger quantities of more sustaining foods than other sections of the community. He announced that it was the intention of the Food Controller to increase the price of milk during April, and to permit an increase in price that would provide for the milk supply next winter. It had been decided, too, to increase the dead-weight price of meat to 9s. 6d. a stone, including offal, which would increase the price to the producer by $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a pound.

On March 7 the House was asked for a new vote of credit for 600,000,000*l.* This was the second largest amount which had ever been asked from Parliament in our financial history. The Treasury had enough in hand to carry on for the remainder of the financial year, and the new vote was intended to give a good start to the new year, which began on April 1. It was estimated that it would enable the Treasury to meet all war calls for the first quarter, or until the end of June. The vote brought the total amount passed by Parliament since the beginning of the war to 6,842,000,000*l.*, made up as follows: 1914-15 (8 months), 362,000,000*l.*; 1915-16, 1,420,000,000*l.*; 1916-17, 2,010,000,000*l.*; and 1917-18, 2,450,000,000. The Chancellor of the Exchequer's financial statement can be summarised as follows:—

Average Daily Expenditure.

| | £ |
|---|-----------|
| April 1 to December 1 - - - - - | 6,686,000 |
| December 1 to February 9 - - - - - | 6,107,000 |
| April 1 to February 9 - - - - - | 6,557,000 |
| New Vote based on estimate of - - - - - | 6,750,000 |

Daily Excess over Estimate.

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Army, Navy, and Munitions - - - - - | 664,000 |
| Loans to Allies and Dominions - - - - - | 239,000 |
| Miscellaneous items - - - - - | 242,000 |
| Total for period under review - - - - - | 361,000,000 |

Recoverable Expenditure.

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Loans to Allies - - - - - | 75,250,000 |
| Advances to Dominions - - - - - | 39,750,000 |
| Purchases of foodstuffs, etc. - - - - - | 86,000,000 |
| Munitions for Allies - - - - - | 5,750,000 |
| Total - - - - - | <u>206,750,000</u> |

Increased Dead-Weight Expenditure.

| | £ |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Army about - - - - - | 221,000,000 |
| Operations in the East - - - - - | 20,000,000 |
| Increased strength - - - - - | 25,000,000 |
| Supplies between - - - - - | 50,000,000 and 60,000,000 |
| Navy about - - - - - | 13,000,000 |
| Miscellaneous services over - - - - - | 20,000,000 |
| Subsidised loaf over - - - - - | 17,000,000 |

Total Loans.

| | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|
| To Allies - - - - - | 1,264,000,000 |
| To Dominions - - - - - | 180,000,000 |
| Increase during the year - - - - - | 460,000,000 |

National Debt.

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Estimate for end of year - - - - - | 5,990,000,000 |
| Loans to Allies and Dominions - - - - - | 1,660,000,000 |

These financial details were supplemented by a review of the general military situation in all the theatres of war in which British troops were engaged, and Mr. Bonar Law was congratulated on his speech by Mr. McKenna, who called attention to the fact that we should begin the next financial year with a daily expenditure of 1,250,000*l.* greater than the expenditure a year ago. There was no doubt in his mind that in the coming year we could not look for any diminution. He therefore urged the House to brace itself to a burden considerably heavier than that which it had had to meet before.

On the report stage of the vote of credit Mr. Austen Chamberlain, who had asked the Prime Minister for a statement on the connexion between the Press and the Government, opened a debate on the Prime Minister's reply. The gist of this was that in all Allied Governments journalists and newspaper proprietors held high office, and the Prime Minister challenged the contention that such men were disqualified from holding office in this country. Mr. Chamberlain in his speech admitted that the House of Commons did not exercise its old authority in the country, but contended that public confidence in the Press had been seriously diminished by recent events. He accepted the principles laid down by the Prime Minister as satisfactory, and took it as a pure coincidence that certain papers had attacked particular servants of the Government, and that shortly afterwards the Government found it impossible to continue those servants in their offices.

Mr. Spencer Leigh Hughes continued the debate in a jocular speech which the Prime Minister afterwards described as extraordinarily brilliant, and Mr. Asquith followed, declaring that there had been an enormous curtailment of the area of journalistic free play. He described the Press as a series of megaphones of varying degrees of range and stridency, but to a very large extent vehicles of one and the same voice. He argued that one practical result had followed: it was very much easier to

manipulate the Press in these days than in the past. He conceded that, in the relative silence of the House of Commons during the war, the Press became the most natural organ for outside discussion, and expressed his view that this duty had been discharged with patriotism.

The Prime Minister rose next to reply on the debate. He claimed that there had been no real challenge of the action of the Government after the explanations that had been given, and found no difficulty in agreeing with the very sound principles which Mr. Asquith had laid down. He brought the House back to the real point at issue, and denied that a rule could be laid down excluding newspaper proprietors from Government in this country.

This question, which appeared to have agitated the country for several weeks, was now disposed of, and the House set itself to consider one of the main measures of the Session—the new Education Bill, the chief provisions of which may be summarised as follows:—

School Attendance.—All children must attend school till the age of 14 years, which may be extended to 15. All children under the age of 18 years must attend continuation schools in the daytime for 320 hours in the year unless they have received full-time education till the age of 16 years.

Employment of Children.—No child under 12 years of age may be employed at all. No child over 12 years of age may be employed on school days except after school hours and before 8 P.M., and on other days except between 6 A.M. and 8 P.M.

School Fees.—No fees may be charged in public elementary schools or in continuation schools.

Physical Welfare.—Provision was made for nursery schools, holiday and school camps, playing fields, physical training, and the medical inspection of places of higher education.

Administrative Provisions.—Local education authorities were made responsible for the provision of all kinds of education in their areas. The limit on the spending powers of authorities for higher education was abolished. Authorities were charged with the administration of the law relating to the employment of children, and were enabled to enforce the law with regard to cruelty to children. The principle of a minimum grant of half an authority's expenditure was introduced.

The Bill was introduced on February 25 and the second reading was taken on March 13. "This Bill asserts the principle of the rights of youth," Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, the Minister of Education, declared on moving the second reading. The Bill was subjected to some criticism, although the general sense of the House was clearly favourable to the proposals of the Government. Mr. Peto moved the rejection of the measure, on the ground not only that the present Parliament had no mandate to deal with the question, but that the proposed extension of the principle of compulsion would practically abolish

parental authority over children up to the age of 18 years. Sir Mark Sykes warmly defended the Bill as an emergency measure, which, in the circumstances of the time, it was the duty of Parliament to pass. The only complaint he had against the Bill was that it did not allow quite enough scope for parental responsibility. He accordingly suggested the introduction of safeguards, which would harness to the coach of legislation the natural force of affection of the parent for the child. Sir Henry Hibbert submitted the difficulties of Lancashire, and particularly of the cotton trade. He objected to the clause compelling the attendance at day continuation schools of every boy and girl from 14 to 18 years of age for 320 hours a year. That was a proposal which, he contended, it was impossible to fit in with the working conditions of the Lancashire cotton industry. In fact, he insisted that no system of education ought so to handicap commerce as to prevent it from fulfilling its obligations to the State.

Mr. Fisher's reply began by explaining that he had no intention to disturb the denominational balance or to revolutionise our local system of educational administration. The cardinal principle of the Bill, he pointed out, was the provision making local authorities responsible for all kinds of education in their areas. He denied that public education weakened the sense of parental responsibility. Education, he declared, was not one of the black arts; its function was not to suppress individuality, but to develop it. The object of the Bill was to provide the greatest possible number of outlets for talent of all descriptions. In support of his contention he pointed to the provisions of the Bill for central schools, higher elementary schools, junior technical schools, and junior commercial schools.

Mr. Fisher gave a rough estimate of the cost of some of the leading provisions of the Bill. The cost of raising the school age would amount to 1,000,000*l.* a year, and of the proposals for continuation education, on the assumption that the size of the classes was limited to 30, to 8,750,000*l.* Nursery schools would absorb another 900,000*l.*, to be divided between rates and taxes. The subject of nursery schools led the Minister to discuss the provisions for physical education, on which he laid great stress. He urged that the collective force of these proposals must greatly improve the health of the people.

Passing to the moral purpose of the Bill, Mr. Fisher contended that the Bill would give the children of poorer parents some measure of the guidance which was universally claimed for the children of richer homes. He asked the House not to suppose that the influence of the continuation school would be limited to the statutory hours of work. Private reading would be encouraged and homework invited, and the school would be a natural introduction to all useful societies formed for artistic or social purposes. If a really effective scheme of selection in this country was wanted, he believed that nothing better could be

got than a general system of day continuation education, which would enable boys and girls of ability to be picked out at different stages of their development to be passed on to the careers for which their natural aptitude fitted them.

Dealing with the Lancashire cotton industry, Mr. Fisher believed that opinion was ripe in the districts affected for the abandonment of "half-time." The continuation proposals no doubt presented peculiar difficulties, and he promised to consider carefully all the arguments that could be brought forward.

But the broad question, Mr. Fisher urged in a final appeal, was whether the present system of education was adequate to the new, serious, and enduring liabilities which the development of the world war had created for the Empire, or to the new civic burdens which Parliament had imposed upon millions of our citizens. He affirmed unhesitatingly that it was not adequate. He believed that it was the duty of Parliament to improve it, and held that, if they allowed their vision to be blurred by a catalogue of passing inconveniences, they would not only lose a golden opportunity, but fail in their great trust to posterity.

The debate on the second reading was continued on March 18. Mr. Marriott urged that education was at the root of the whole problem of reconstruction. He rejoiced at the provision made in the Bill for physical training, but appealed for games, which developed *moral* and character, as well as gymnastics, which generated muscle. He warmly commended the Bill as the first real attempt made in this country to lay broad and deep the foundations of a scheme of education which would be truly national.

Sir Philip Magnus, the member for London University, declared that the Bill had met with an unprecedented measure of approval. It was regarded as a measure well calculated to advance the knowledge, stimulate the intelligence, and improve the physical condition of the great majority of children.

Mr. O'Grady, from the Labour benches, told the House that the Bill had been unanimously approved by great bodies of organised workers. He expressed the hope that the measure would give our people the opportunity, which they had not had before, of learning their industry on scientific principles as well as by the ordinary practice of the workshop. He made it perfectly plain that the former opposition of parents to raising the school age had completely gone by the board.

The debate was wound up by Mr. Herbert Lewis, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education, who replied to such detailed criticism as had been made, and the Bill was read a second time without a division.

The shipping situation was the only other major problem which occupied the attention of the House of Commons before the recess. On March 5 Sir Eric Geddes introduced his first Navy Estimates, and made an appeal to both employers and men in the shipbuilding industry to increase output. "We

cannot afford holidays," said the First Lord, "while there are food queues." The shipbuilding question came up again in the House on March 20, when Sir Eric Geddes brought home the gravity of the submarine menace by giving for the first time the actual figures of British, Allied, and neutral tonnage losses and new construction. The British mercantile marine, it appeared from the First Lord's speech, had been reduced by 20 per cent. since the beginning of the war, and the monthly output of British shipbuilding yards would have to be nearly doubled before the monthly rate of sinking was made good. The First Lord also announced the appointment of Lord Pirrie as Controller-General of Merchant Shipbuilding. In the ensuing debate the Admiralty did not escape criticism, more especially for publishing misleading estimates and not disclosing the actual facts and figures of losses and construction. Sir Eric Geddes announced that returns of tonnage sunk would in future be published quarterly, and that the figures of output would be given regularly.

While the Commons were thus busy with shipbuilding, the Lords discussed unrest in Ireland. On March 12 Lord Salisbury moved, "That, as the present situation in Ireland has become a danger to the Empire and a menace to the successful prosecution of the war and to the security of life and property, it is incumbent on His Majesty's Government to enforce the law in that country." His Lordship painted the situation in very dark colours, alleging that a state of sheer lawlessness prevailed in Ireland. The worst counties were Limerick, Tipperary, Kerry, Galway, and Clare, and unless the Government took up a firm attitude disaffection might become more general. Lord Curzon replied for the Government with a tribute to Mr. Duke, the Irish Secretary, who, he declared, had lived laborious days and spent sleepless nights in combating an organised conspiracy against law and order. He explained that a marked change in the situation in Ireland took place at the end of January. It was then that the revolutionary party discovered and employed a new method in their campaign against the Government—the association of their general propaganda of disorder with an appeal to the ineradicable instinct of land hunger. When the Sinn Féiners made the new gospel of tillage an excuse for planting the banner of an Irish Republic, the Government were no longer confronted with political agitation, but with a criminal conspiracy. Mr. Duke, with the sanction of the Government, then took military action. The people generally adopted an attitude of friendly support of the line taken by the Executive, and the Roman Catholic clergy exercised their influence in every way to prevent collision and impose restraint. Official reports showed that the results of the action of the Government had been so far successful that cattle driving had ceased in Clare, the seizure of land was being prevented, the police had effected the necessary arrests without difficulty, and illegal drillings only continued in

isolated districts. The reports, too, of the tour of Lord French, were generally to the effect that the strong action which had been taken was having good consequences everywhere. At the same time Lord Curzon admitted that such a period of commotion could not be swiftly succeeded by a period of content. He gave the assurance that the military would be kept in the disturbed areas so long as it was necessary to show that the Government were both determined and able to enforce the law in Ireland. Lord Salisbury accepted Lord Curzon's assurances as satisfactory, and withdrew his motion.

The attitude of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers to the "comb," referred to above, may be taken as typical of the prevailing feeling of the Labour Party as a whole. Satisfied Labour was not, but it realised that in the existing difficult circumstances of the war the only practical policy was in the main to support the Government. This was the prevailing feeling at the seventeenth Annual Conference of the Labour Party which opened at Nottingham on January 23. Peculiar interest was given to the Conference by the presence and speeches of a number of "fraternal delegates," from other countries, including MM. Renaudel and Jean Longuet, of the French Socialist Party, and MM. Emile Vandervelde and Louis de Bronckere, of the Belgian Socialist Party. The principal question on which the Congress pronounced was whether the Labour members should continue to co-operate with the Government or should withdraw. There was a good deal of feeling in certain quarters of the Congress that Labour should withdraw. But no resolution was taken, chiefly as Mr. Arthur Henderson pointed out, in order to maintain the appearance of unanimity in favour of Labour's support of the Government. Accordingly Mr. Henderson himself moved "the previous question." The supreme task of the hour, he said, was the promotion of a people's peace, and for the sake of that he begged the party "to allow this Government to go on." The previous question was carried by a majority of 1,163,000 votes.

But if for the moment the Labour Party decided to co-operate with the Government, it was already making plans for independent action in the future by widening its scope. On February 26, at the resumed Annual Conference of the Party at the Central Hall, Westminster, was adopted the new constitution of the party under which it was transformed from a federation of societies into a national democratic political organisation open to every worker who labours "by hand or by brain." This event marked the determination of the party leaders to seize the opportunity given by the widening of the electorate and the enfranchisement of women under the Representation of the People Act, and to make the Labour movement the most powerful political force in the country. The aim was to be achieved in three ways :—

(1) By bringing into the ranks of the party those who had

no need to join trade unions and no desire to join Socialist societies, but whose sympathies were democratic; (2) by giving special facilities and encouragement to women electors to join the party; and (3) by forming local organisations in as many of the redistributed constituencies as possible and putting forward anything up to 400 candidates at the next election.

Meanwhile, however, the great mass of the working people of the country realised the all-importance of carrying the war to a successful conclusion. This was manifested, for instance, in the ready and widespread response to the appeal to munition workers, in view of the shortage of munitions at the front, to forgo their Easter holiday; and no less in the response made by women to the appeal for women workers either for the Queen Mary's Women's Army Auxiliary Corps (the W.A.A.C.'s), the Women's Royal Air Force (the "Penguins"), the Women's Land Army, and the Women's Royal Naval Service (the "Wrens").

CHAPTER II.

MAN-POWER AND MONEY-POWER.

WHEN the House of Commons reassembled on April 9, a feeling of deep anxiety brooded over the members. The German onslaught on the Western Front had had serious results for the Allies; the news from Neuve Chapelle spread through the Lobbies some time before the rising of the House; and it was generally agreed in the country that further drafts on man-power would be unavoidable. So urgent was the need considered to be that the Prime Minister on the opening day of the Session moved the first reading of the new Man-Power Bill (which had been drafted by a committee of Ministers, with Sir George Cave as Chairman), the House waiving the customary formality of the giving of a day's notice of the introduction of a Bill. All other Government business was set aside until the Bill had been passed through all its stages.

In submitting the Bill to the House ("A Bill to make further provision with respect to military service during the present war"), Mr. Lloyd George set forth the critical military situation in the West. The enemy was clearly committed to an attempt to secure a military decision this year by breaking the Armies of the Allies. That meant assault piled upon assault, in complete recklessness of everything but victory. There were seven, or possibly eight, months of campaigning weather available for the purpose. The Prime Minister went on to give a review, the first authoritative review, of the course of the recent fighting and of the events which led to the appointment of General Foch to co-ordinate the strategy of the Allies. But while strategic unity was a fundamental condition of victory, success would be impossible without a further supply of men. Already

the Government had raised during the first quarter more than its proportion of the original number of men estimated as the minimum required. A further strict comb-out of some of the essential industries would be necessary. A very large levy was to be taken from the munition works, amounting to something like 100,000 Grade 1 men. A call for 50,000 men had been made from the coal industry. Military needs would necessitate the calling up of another 50,000. The transport services were also to be called upon to release the greatest possible number of picked men. Further calls were to be made on the Civil Service. "I do not think," remarked Mr. George, "that it is realised how much the Civil Service has done already. On the one hand, it has had to release a large number of men for the Army; and, on the other hand, it has had to meet, and is meeting, an increased strain of work; but, even at the risk of some dislocation, we must call upon it to do more, and a clean cut of young, fit men must be made. It is proposed that no fit men below the age of 25 should be retained. We comb-out beyond that. That is what is called the clean cut." The Government also intended issuing orders under the Act passed in January cancelling occupational exemptions in selected industries by age blocks. Moreover, the length of the calling-up notices had been shortened from fourteen to seven days.

But still more men would be necessary, and the first proposal of the new Bill was to raise the military age up to 50, and in certain specified cases where men with special qualifications, such as medical men, are needed, to 55. It was estimated that 7 per cent. of the men between 42 and 50 would be available for fighting. It was also provided that His Majesty might, by proclamation declaring that a national emergency had arisen, direct that any certificate of exemption should cease to have effect. This was another means of arriving at a clean cut so as to secure fit young men for the Army; the men would be taken or left on medical grounds only. Further, it was proposed to take power to reconstitute the tribunals, to regulate their areas of work, to standardise the grounds of exemption, and to limit the rights of appeal. Local tribunals, like appeal tribunals, were to become nominated bodies, and reduced in size. Finally, ministers of religion were to be brought within the Act for non-combatant services. The Bill also intended to tap man-power in Ireland, by extending the Service Acts to Ireland under the same conditions as in Great Britain. As there was no machinery in existence, it was expected to take some weeks before actual enrolments began, but when the arrangements were complete, the Government would, by Order in Council, put the Act immediately into operation. "Meanwhile," Mr. George announced, "we intend to invite Parliament to pass a measure for self-government for Ireland." The Report of the remarkable Convention which had been held in Ireland, had just brought its proceedings to a termination, and afforded the British Parliament another opportunity of approaching this vexed question with more hope

of success. The Convention had reported by a majority, but this was not such as to justify the Government in saying that it represented substantial agreement. That meant that the Government must accept the responsibility of submitting to Parliament, with such guidance as the report of the Convention afforded, such proposals for the establishment of self-government in Ireland as were just and could be carried without violent controversy.

On the following day the debate on the second reading was opened by Sir George Cave, the Minister in charge of the Bill, who contended that the raising of the military age to 50 years would bring in a substantial number of men who would be of real military value. He made it clear that it was not proposed to give any undertaking that these men should be employed for home defence only. With that proviso, he declared, every attempt would be made to see that the older men now to be enlisted were put to the precise military work for which they were found best fitted. A reference to the proposal to take men between 50 and 55 years of age in a very great national emergency led him to explain that the Government wished this to be the last Man-Power Bill of the war.

There was a good deal of excited interruption from the Nationalists when Sir George Cave came to his vindication of the Irish cause. He told the House that the Government were advised that the clause would give a large number of men. If, he declared, only five divisions could be expected the clause would be worth passing into law. It had been said that an Army would be needed to enforce it, but the Government did not think so.

The rejection of the Bill was moved by Sir Charles Hobhouse, who asserted that "the measure diminishes the naval and economic power of the nation without adding commensurate military strength." His argument, however, was largely based on fear of the effect of the proposals on trade. He calculated that, apart from Ireland, the Government would get 250,000 men outside the Bill and 150,000 inside it.

A weighty speech was delivered by Sir Donald Maclean. Speaking from his experience as Chairman of the House of Commons Appeal Tribunal, he doubted whether more than 3 per cent. of the men between 42 and 50 years of age would be of anything approaching military value. He warned the Government that they might be crushed down with an avalanche of Grade 3 men, mostly unfit altogether. He told the House that the experience of the last two years was that the sickness casualties of men between 35 and 41 years of age were two and a half times greater than those of men between 27 and 35. He asked the Government to consider what tremendous risks they were taking by raising the age. His advice was that the age should not be raised beyond 47 or 48 years at the outside.

Mr. Dillon referred to the Irish measures of the Bill, and challenged the Government to take an Irish plebescite on their

proposals. Mr. Asquith followed, and his critical attitude was endorsed by a considerable section of the House. He asked the Government to consider whether they could not fix a lower age-limit than 50 years, and to omit the provision for the calling up of men up to 56 years of age in a grave emergency. He expressed a hope that the Government would introduce some machinery by which the cases of men of the higher ages could be considered by a tribunal, not in reference to individuals, but to the general conditions of their businesses and trades as a whole. He viewed, too, with misgiving the supersession of the tribunals, and called for some modification of that part of the scheme. On the question of the inclusion of Ireland, Mr. Asquith told the House that the plan had been twice considered and rejected by the Government of which he was the head, and expressed his conviction that the arguments in favour of that conclusion had been strengthened by subsequent events. He argued that compulsion could not be introduced in Ireland to-day with any approach to general consent, and went so far as to say that it would be an act of terrible shortsightedness to precede the grant of self-government by imposing upon Ireland a measure which was obnoxious to a very large number of the people.

Mr. Bonar Law set forth the Government's intentions, and made it clear that they would not give way on any of the cardinal principles of the Bill. He told members frankly that, while the Government were willing to listen to criticism, they would not allow anything in the Bill which they considered necessary to be altered in one iota. He admitted the small value comparatively of certain men of the higher age, but insisted that the Government needed the best men they could get. He reminded the House that men up to 50 years of age were employed now in the French and German Armies, and up to a higher age in the Austrian Army. While the most critical time would probably be the end of May and June, it was unquestionable that the men to be taken under the Bill would become useful before the eight months' campaign was over. The Government, in fact, believed that what they were doing might possibly make the difference between victory and defeat. Mr. Law was equally explicit on the subject of Ireland. He declared that the Nationalists did not understand what the feeling in Great Britain was on this question, and told them that it was a great mistake to suppose that the Government had put compulsion for Ireland in the Bill as a pious opinion. The proposal had been put in because the Government intended to carry it. They believed that it would effect a difference of military strength, which made it their duty to face the consequences, whatever they might be. He asked the House, if there was going to be a vote against the Irish clause, to record it on the second reading. He pledged the Government not to go back on it, and declared that if the people thought that they were making a mistake they would give loyal support to any other Government which wished to carry on the war.

When Sir Auckland Geddes rose to wind up the debate for the Government, he was refused a hearing for some minutes by the Irish Nationalists, who called loudly for Mr. Duke, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, to reply to the speeches which had been made from their benches. The Speaker at length succeeded in restoring order, and Sir Auckland Geddes informed the House that there was no alternative to the Bill but to let the Armies down.

The Bill was read a second time by a majority of 223.

In the Committee stage the most important discussion was on the extension of compulsory military service to Ireland, which was ultimately carried by a majority of 165, after a debate which lasted nearly eight hours. Before the Bill passed through Committee the Government announced the withdrawal of the proposal to make ministers of religion subject to compulsory military service. The third reading was carried on April 16 by 301 votes to 103—a majority of 198.

The House of Lords quickly passed the Bill through all its stages, and the Bill became law on April 18, within ten days of its introduction. It was a long time since a first-class Government measure had passed through the House of Commons with so few changes. The man-power scheme remained unaltered in all its essential provisions, for the Government had only accepted two amendments of any real substance, one restoring the immunity of ministers of religion and the other modifying the new tribunal scheme in the sense of a fuller recognition of the appeal rights of the citizen. Passed by Parliament in a great military emergency, the Act was put forward by the Government as the last man-power measure of the war. It completed the structure of compulsory military service, which Mr. Asquith began in January, 1916. The first Service Act, passed at that time to fulfil the famous pledge to the married men who had attested under the Derby scheme, confined the obligation to single men up to 40 years of age in Great Britain. The second Act, passed in May of the same year, extended the obligation to married men up to 40 years of age in Great Britain, and strengthened the first Act in other ways. In the interval there had been other Acts, including one passed last year for a review of exceptions and another passed in January, 1918, to enable the Government to take into their own hands the whole question of the exemption of men on an occupational basis.

The new Act extended the military age to 50 years, and in a national emergency to 55 years; duly qualified medical practitioners who had not attained the age of 56 were made immediately liable to military service. In regard to Ireland, His Majesty might, by Order in Council, extend the Act to Ireland, with the necessary modifications and adaptations.

During the debate on the Bill, the Government promised to try to carry a Home Rule Bill for Ireland simultaneously with the preparations for the carrying out of the Military Service Act. Both Mr. Bonar Law and Mr. Barnes expressed the Government's intention in this matter, and the Prime Minister added

his word to theirs, and repeated the pledge given by Mr. Barnes that if the House of Lords failed to pass a Home Rule Bill supported by the House of Commons the Government would resign. Mr. Devlin welcomed the pronouncement, and promised the Government that, if they would bring an Irish Parliament into existence, he would be the first to join up as a private or in any other capacity. He offered to constitute himself the leader of the young and generous hearts, who would be touched by the chivalry and justice of England's action, and would do his best to rally them to her support at this time of bitter peril. "What more," he asked, "can a man offer than that? It is for you to say." Even before the Military Service Bill became law it was understood that a new Home Rule Bill was in course of preparation, based on the recommendations of the Irish Convention, which had reported on April 13. The scheme of Irish self-government approved by the majority of the Convention may be briefly stated to include the establishment of an Irish Parliament and Executive, with full powers over internal legislation and administration and over direct taxation. Representation in the Imperial Parliament was retained in the form of a delegation of forty-two Irish members. The principle of an Irish contribution to the cost of Imperial services was accepted in the Report, but left indeterminate. A Senate of sixty-four members was to be constituted by the method of allotting representation to different interests, while the Irish House of Commons, numbering 200, was to include a guaranteed 40 per cent. of Unionists, chosen in the South by nomination and in Ulster by additional direct election. The supreme authority of the Imperial Parliament was recognised by the reservation of a number of powers relating to the Crown, to foreign relations, to the Army and Navy, and to minor common services and interests. The Police and the Post Office were so reserved for the period of the war. The Report set forth certain provisions for the speedy completion of Land Purchase. Finally the vexed question of the control of Customs and Excise, on which no agreement was possible even among those who sincerely sought agreement, was definitely left for future decision. "The Convention," in the words of Sir Horace Plunkett to the Prime Minister, "has laid the foundation of Irish agreement unprecedented in history."

On April 19 two changes in the Cabinet were officially announced. The Earl of Derby, Secretary of State for War, became British Ambassador in Paris, being succeeded by Viscount Milner. The vacancy in the War Cabinet occasioned by this transference was filled by the appointment of Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

These changes were the subject of a good deal of discussion in the Lobby of the House of Commons. But they were soon eclipsed by the budget proposals which Mr. Bonar Law placed before the House on April 22. This, the sixth war budget and Mr. Bonar Law's second, was universally characterised as "a great taxing budget," imposing additional taxation

estimated to bring in 114 millions sterling. The changes in brief may be set down as follows:—

Income tax standard rate increased from 5s. to 6s. in the pound.

New allowance for wives and dependent relatives (25l. in each case) for tax-payers whose total income did not exceed 800l.

Farmers' tax to be doubled.

Limit of super-tax exemption lowered from 3,000l. to 2,500l., and the rates of super-tax payable under the graduated scale increased up to a maximum of 4s. 6d. in the pound.

Twopenny stamp on cheques.

Beer and spirit duties doubled (beer from 25s. to 50s. per standard barrel, and spirits from 14s. 9d. to 30s. per gallon).

Tobacco and match duties raised (tobacco from 6s. 5d. to 8s. 2d. per lb.).

Higher sugar duty—an additional duty of 11s. 8d. per cwt.

A luxury tax of 2d. in the shilling.

Letter rate raised to 1½d. and post-card rate to 1d.

The following is a statement of revenue and expenditure for 1918-19:—

ESTIMATED REVENUE, 1918-19.

| | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------------|
| Customs - - - - - | £71,650,000 | |
| Add proposed additional taxation - - - | 22,850,000 | |
| | | £94,500,000 |
| Excise - - - - - | £35,350,000 | |
| Add proposed additional taxation - - - | 17,850,000 | |
| | | 53,200,000 |
| | | <u>£147,700,000</u> |
| Estate, etc., Duties - - - - - | - - - - - | £31,500,000 |
| Stamps - - - - - | £8,500,000 | |
| Add proposed additional taxation - - - | 750,000 | |
| | | 9,250,000 |
| Land Tax - - - - - | - - - - - | 650,000 |
| House Duty - - - - - | - - - - - | 1,950,000 |
| Income Tax (including super-tax) - - - | £267,500,000 | |
| Add proposed additional taxation - - - | 22,950,000 | |
| | | 290,450,000 |
| Excess Profits Duty, etc. - - - - - | - - - - - | 300,000,000 |
| Land Value Duties - - - - - | - - - - - | 700,000 |
| | | <u>£634,500,000</u> |
| Total Receipts from Taxes - - - - - | - - - - - | <u>£782,200,000</u> |
| Postal Service - - - - - | £24,600,000 | |
| Add proposed increase in charges - - - | 3,400,000 | |
| | | £28,000,000 |
| Telegraph Service - - - - - | - - - - - | 3,500,000 |
| Telephone Service - - - - - | - - - - - | 6,500,000 |
| | | <u>£38,000,000</u> |
| Crown Lands - - - - - | - - - - - | 650,000 |
| Receipts from Sundry Loans, etc. - - - | - - - - - | 6,000,000 |
| Miscellaneous - - - - - | - - - - - | 15,200,000 |
| | | <u>£59,850,000</u> |
| Total Receipts from Non-Tax Revenue - - - | - - - - - | <u>£842,050,000</u> |
| Total Revenue - - - - - | - - - - - | 2,130,147,000 |
| Deficit - - - - - | - - - - - | <u>£2,972,197,000</u> |

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE, 1918-19.

Consolidated Fund Services.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| National Debt Services :— | |
| Inside the Fixed Debt Charge - - - - - | £19,150,000 |
| Outside the Fixed Debt Charge - - - - - | 295,850,000 |
| | <u>£315,000,000</u> |
| Payments to Local Taxation Accounts, etc. - - - - - | 9,700,000 |
| Other Consolidated Fund Services - - - - - | 1,714,000 |
| | <u>£326,414,000</u> |

Supply Services.

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| Army - - - - - | £15,000 |
| Navy - - - - - | 17,000 |
| Air Force - - - - - | 7,000 |
| Ministry of Munitions (including Ordnance Factories) - - - - - | 1,000 |
| Civil Services :— | |
| Old Age Pensions - - - - - | £12,085,000 |
| Ministry of Labour, Insurance, etc. - - - - - | 9,619,000 |
| Other Civil Services (including Public Education) - - - - - | 42,325,000 |
| | <u>64,029,000</u> |
| Customs and Excise, and Inland Revenue Departments - - - - - | 5,573,000 |
| Post Office Services - - - - - | 26,141,000 |
| | <u>£95,783,000</u> |
| Votes of Credit - - - - - | £2,550,000,000 |
| Total Expenditure - - - - - | <u>£2,972,197,000</u> |

FINAL BALANCE SHEET.

1918-19 (Estimate).

| | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Expenditure - - - - - | £2,972,197,000 |
| Revenue - - - - - | 842,050,000 |
| | <u>£2,130,147,000</u> |

1917-18 (Actual).

| | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Expenditure - - - - - | £2,696,221,000 |
| Revenue - - - - - | 707,235,000 |
| | <u>£1,988,986,000</u> |

In introducing his budget Mr. Law reviewed the finance of the past year, and expressed satisfaction with the fulfilment of his expectation a year ago that the United States would assist the Allies financially to the full extent of their ability. The United States, in fact, had advanced to the Allies during the year no less a sum than 950,000,000*l.*, of which approximately 500,000,000*l.* had been advanced to this country. As for the balance sheet for the current year, Mr. Bonar Law submitted an elaborate calculation to show that his estimates were based on the guiding principle of our war finance that we should raise at least as much revenue as would cover our peace expenditure and the increased debt charge, if the war were to come to an end. He showed that this aim could be achieved in this year's budget, which allowed for the gigantic expenditure of 2,972,197,000*l.*, by a revenue, on the existing basis of taxation, of 774,250,000*l.*, together with new taxation to the estimated amount of 67,800,000*l.* As for this new taxation, Mr. Law

explained that he held it to be his duty to levy as much as the nation could bear, but at the same time he was strongly of opinion that it was essential that the Government should not put on taxation on such a scale as to cripple every industry and every financial institution in this country, and thereby make it impossible to obtain the money which it was necessary to borrow to carry on the war. "Therefore we must be modest," he said. Proceeding to outline his schemes of new taxation, he devoted a long passage to the treatment of farmers. There was a widespread feeling in the country that farmers were getting undue profits. The doubling of their income tax therefore seemed reasonable. Mr. Law justified the new beer and spirit duties on their productivity, and the changes in the postal rates on the ground that other countries had already led the way. He also made a special point of the great productiveness of the tobacco duty, which he proposed to raise for the second successive year. Finally, he came to the great novelty of the budget—a tax on luxuries. He made it clear that he was, to a great extent, following the example of France in this matter, and proposed to adopt the general principles accepted by the French Government. He had no cut-and-dried schedule of the luxuries to be taxed, and he asked the House to set up a Select Committee to prepare it, with the advice of the traders who would be affected. He anticipated the obvious criticism that he was leaving the most difficult part of the budget to be dealt with by the House of Commons. He had a very sound reason for this, inasmuch as he desired, if possible, to get the widest sanction for such novel proposals.

In the course of the debate the Chancellor of the Exchequer was warmly complimented on his speech, and Mr. McKenna, his predecessor at the Treasury, voiced the general opinion when he stated that the raising of the postal rates and the increase of the penny stamp on cheques would give the Chancellor of the Exchequer more trouble than all the other increases combined, though they only involved an additional 5,000,000*l.* out of the 114,000,000*l.* of new taxation now proposed.

On April 23 the debate was resumed from the Front Opposition Bench by Mr. Herbert Samuel. He gave expression to the general feeling that the budget was a reasonable one, and that the taxes were well devised to secure their purpose. He was glad that the minor changes in the income tax tended to continue the process of placing the duty upon a family rather than upon an individual basis. He regretted the proposal to increase the stamp duty on cheques, and still more the abolition of the penny post. As for the tax on luxuries, he suggested that the right way of dealing with the matter was to prevent the manufacture of luxuries by greater restriction of employment in non-essential industries.

Mr. Baldwin replied for the Treasury. He had some interesting things to say about extravagance in the early part of

the war. At that time he was in business, and had every opportunity of seeing the beginning of an orgy of extravagance which it had taken the serious efforts of the Government for the last two years to grapple with. Indeed, it was an open question for some time whether the Government or the extravagance would come out on top. Turning to the budget proposals, he freely admitted that the luxury tax would not have occurred to a professional economist. He urged that the Government were justified in asking a Select Committee to investigate the possibilities of the tax, inasmuch as they had a great deal of popular opinion behind them.

Mr. Sydney Arnold demanded a levy on capital to meet a large part of our war liabilities. He proposed a levy in two instalments, one at the end of the war and the second two years later, each of an average yield of 12 per cent. on individuals in the manner of the death duties on a graduated scale.

This programme was vigorously combated by Mr. Theodore Taylor, who contended that the effect of taking slices of a living man's capital was simply to take the heart out of him. He regarded the taxation of capital as neither right nor practicable.

Mr. Illingworth, the Postmaster-General, joined in the debate with a brief reply to criticism of the new postal rates. He justified the increases in the letter and post-card rates on the ground that the Post Office was at present barely self-supporting. He asked the House to recognise that the user ought to pay the expenses of the Post Office, and insisted that the increased rates were an unfortunate necessity.

The debate turned for a time on the new position of the farmer. Mr. Turton expressed the belief that farmers would look upon their treatment in the budget as unjust.

In his reply Mr. Bonar Law acknowledged that on the whole the budget had been well received. Dealing first with the new tax on the farmer, he explained that, apart altogether from the money to be obtained, there was evidence which could not be overlooked that farmers were not paying their full share of the burden imposed upon the nation by the war. He denied that farmers were being hardly used, and declared that, if his treatment of them was compared with that of other classes, they certainly could not complain. Mr. Bonar Law told the House frankly that he would be reluctant to give up any of the taxes now in the budget. He had heard criticism of his proposal for doubling the stamp on cheques, but he had consulted beforehand representative bankers, and elicited their opinion that the change would be accepted readily and would not cause great inconvenience. That was his belief too, and he hoped the House would allow the tax to go through. "After all," he reminded the House, "a million is a million." As for the increase in the postal rates, that was a change which had been accepted in every other country. He defended the new sugar duty as fair, and pointed to the fact that a man with a wife and

four or five children would gain twice as much by the subsidised loaf as he would lose by the increased tax on sugar. After justifying his proposal to set up a Committee of the House of Commons to frame a schedule of articles to come under the luxury tax, Mr. Bonar Law turned to the general question of expenditure and economy. He did not deny that there was great waste and that a great deal of money was being spent that might be saved. Still, he claimed that, since he had been Chancellor of the Exchequer, there had been immense improvements in Treasury control over the departments.

After a debate in which the Government made no concessions, not even on the proposal to double the stamp duty on cheques, the Finance Bill was read a first time on Wednesday, May 1.

While the Government seemed certain of carrying their budget proposals, they had to meet what developed into serious opposition in connexion with certain aspects of their war policy. One was the resignation of General Trenchard from the Air Staff; the other was the letter from Major-General Sir Frederick Maurice which appeared in *The Times* of May 7, charging Ministers with a series of misstatements on the military position.

The Trenchard resignation was discussed in the House of Commons on April 29, on Mr. Pringle's motion reducing the salary of the Secretary of State for the Royal Air Force by 100%. No information was sought or given about the dispute which led to General Trenchard's resignation, and ultimately it was announced that the new Air Minister (Sir William Weir) proposed to offer General Trenchard another position in the Air Force. The chief feature of the debate was the broad question whether members of Parliament who were also in one of the services should use their "inside" knowledge for the purpose of criticising the allocation of their superior officers. Sir Harry Verney, one of the earliest speakers in the debate, declared that there was a universal feeling of disgust among officers at the front at the "dismissal" of General Trenchard.

Sir Harry Verney explained he had been told that in saying this he was taking an improper course. Lord Hugh Cecil claimed that a member of Parliament was bound to give of the best of his knowledge and experience to the debates, subject only to the obligations of personal honour. He accordingly criticised the Government severely for their treatment of General Trenchard. He paid a tribute to General Trenchard's capacity for organisation and leadership. If Ministers, he exclaimed with some passion, had a man like him at the head of the Air Service, they might find that he would not always listen to the ideas of every amateur strategist in the Cabinet. The Prime Minister told Lord Hugh Cecil that he had no right to make such a remark. He declared categorically that no amateur strategist in the War Cabinet had ever suggested anything of the kind to Sir Hugh Trenchard. Lord Hugh Cecil angrily

retorted that the Prime Minister really seemed to care about nothing except his own retention in office. This he was urged by Unionist members to withdraw, but in vain. The Prime Minister in his reply said he agreed with every word that had been said about the distinguished service which General Trenchard had rendered to the country. He thought it necessary, however, at once to challenge the claim that members of Parliament serving in the various branches of the Forces had a different standard of discipline from others who were not members. He recalled that when he was Secretary of State for War the Army Council had called his attention to criticism of Army administration made by members of Parliament, who utilised knowledge which they got as officers in the Army, and had urged that they ought to decide between being members of Parliament and officers. As for General Trenchard, Mr. Lloyd George explained that he had not been dismissed but had resigned. Accordingly the question for Ministers was whether it was wise to accept the resignation. The Cabinet asked General Smuts to look finally into the matter, and he came to the conclusion that General Trenchard's special qualities were not used to the best advantage as Chief of the Air Staff. He stated that the Cabinet had no doubt that General Sykes' (General Trenchard's successor) qualities were better adapted for the position of Chief of the Air Staff than those of General Trenchard. There was no man, the Prime Minister continued, with a greater admiration for General Trenchard than Sir William Weir, to whose foresight he attributed in large measure the efficiency of the Air Force. It was Sir William Weir's deliberate opinion that General Sykes was better fitted to be Chief of the Air Staff than General Trenchard. He then announced that there was every hope that General Trenchard would be retained in a position of considerable power in the Air Service. Finally, the Prime Minister paid a tribute to the four months' work of Lord Rothermere as head of the Air Service. He declared that it was no small achievement to have set up a well-organised Air Staff. Lord Rothermere had also brought about a very necessary fusion between the military and naval branches of the Force. He appealed to the House and the country to give his successor every opportunity to do his best to increase the efficiency of the Force, at a time when it was being put to a supreme test, from which, so far, it had emerged triumphantly.

Mr. Asquith, who spoke next, welcomed the announcement that the unrivalled services of General Trenchard were to be retained in the Air Force. He declined to go as far as the Prime Minister in the matter of the limitation of the duties of members of Parliament engaged on active service in the war. He did not see how members who had gained general knowledge of the conditions of war could be prevented from using it for the information of Parliament. He thought some of the proceed-

ings of the War Cabinet regarding the resignation of General Trenchard were regrettable.

Sir Edward Carson told the House that all the officers of the Air Service whom he had met recently had told him that the soul had gone out of the service when General Trenchard had gone. He admitted that it was some consolation to know that General Trenchard was to be retained in the service. The debate concluded with a division on Mr. Pringle's motion which was lost by 90 votes.

More serious was the debate on the letter of General Maurice, in which the writer, a soldier who had been intimately concerned with the disposition of our forces, challenged the veracity of ministerial statements in the House of Commons, selecting three in particular which, he alleged, gave "a totally misleading impression" of what occurred. In the first place he disputed a statement by Mr. Bonar Law that the extension of the British line was not settled by the Versailles Council. In the second place he challenged as "incorrect" an implication in the Prime Minister's statement that the strength of the British Army was greater on January 1, 1918, than twelve months earlier. In the third place he gave the lie direct to the Prime Minister's estimate of white British troops in the Eastern theatres of war.

At the end of question time on the day on which the letter to *The Times* was published (May 7) Mr. Asquith rose and asked what steps the Government proposed to take to enable the House to examine the allegations made by the late Director of Military Operations. Mr. Bonar Law, in a considered reply, announced that the question of military discipline involved in the writing of such a letter was being dealt with by the Army Council in the ordinary way. He strongly urged that Government could not be carried on if inquiry into the conduct of Ministers should be considered necessary whenever their action was challenged by one of their servants who had occupied a position of the highest confidence. Inasmuch, however, as General Maurice's allegations affected the honour of Ministers, he announced that the Government proposed to invite two Judges to inquire into the charges and to report as quickly as possible. This announcement was received with murmurs of dissatisfaction, and Mr. George Lambert asked Mr. Bonar Law to substitute for two Judges three distinguished members of the House of Commons. Mr. Bonar Law replied that the course he had suggested was, in the opinion of the Government, the best method of satisfying the House that they had not wilfully made misleading statements. He reminded members that the most secret documents would have to be examined, and suggested that a Select Committee would be a very unsuitable tribunal.

Mr. Asquith rose again to ask if a Bill was to be introduced to enable the two Judges to take evidence on oath. "We did not consider that was necessary," Mr. Bonar Law replied. He

was sure that every one involved would be only too ready to place all information at the disposal of the Judges.

The questioning was taken up by Sir Edward Carson, who wished to know whether the proceedings before the Judges would be public, and whether Cabinet Ministers and ex-Cabinet Ministers would be examined. Mr. Bonar Law thought that the inquiry must obviously be held in private. He urged, too, that, if the House had confidence in the impartiality of the Judges, they should be the best able to decide who should be examined.

The next speaker was Sir Hedworth Meux, who asked Mr. Bonar Law whether he was aware that the answers which he had given would be received with the greatest dissatisfaction by the whole Army and Navy. "They are sick to death of the way things are going on," he declared. His passionate declamation was, however, cut short by the Speaker, who pointed out that he was entitled to ask a question but not to deliver a Hyde Park oration. Sir Hedworth Meux joined in the laughter with which the rebuke was greeted. Sir Edward Carson thereupon rose once more and asked how a Cabinet Minister or an ex-Cabinet Minister could be absolved from his obligation of secrecy without an Act of Parliament. Mr. Bonar Law retorted that there ought to be no fear that the Government desired to burke the matter, since they proposed to submit it to two Judges. "I shall be glad," he continued, turning to Mr. Asquith, "to allow the right hon. gentleman to select them, if he desires." Mr. Asquith intimated by an emphatic shake of the head that he would decline the task, and subsequently expressed his view that the House ought to have an opportunity of discussing the matter. He asked the Government for a day for the purpose. Mr. Bonar Law at once agreed, and asked Mr. Asquith, in his turn, whether he preferred that the Government should not proceed with the setting up of the Court until after the discussion. "Certainly," said Mr. Asquith.

A final question was put by Mr. Pringle, who asked whether all disciplinary proceedings against General Maurice would be suspended pending any finding by the Court. Mr. Bonar Law refused to promise this. Even if every statement were true, he declared, the discipline of the Army would be impossible if such a letter were allowed to pass.

Mr. Asquith followed up his questions in the House of Commons about General Maurice's letter by giving notice of the following motion:—

"That a Select Committee of this House be appointed to inquire into the allegations of incorrectness in certain statements of Ministers of the Crown to this House, contained in a letter of Major-General Maurice, late Director of Military Operations, published in the Press on May 7."

The Government treated this motion as a vote of censure and resisted it with all the strength at its disposal. Urgent

whips were sent out by the Government and by the Opposition. A very full House assembled on May 9 to hear the defence of the Government. Mr. Asquith submitted that a Select Committee of five members of the House was preferable in this case as a court of inquiry to a tribunal of two Judges, since the matter was one which peculiarly concerned the House of Commons.

The Prime Minister replied by dealing at once with General Maurice's charges one by one. His own statement that the fighting strength of the British forces in France was greater on January 1, 1918, than on January 1, 1917 was, he explained, based on official records of the War Office. Similarly the figures concerning the white divisions in the East were also official. The statement that there were three British divisions in Egypt was made at a Cabinet meeting, at which General Maurice was present. On the third count, the extension of the front of General Gough's army, Mr. Lloyd George gave more detailed information. Incidentally he stated that General Maurice, although in the building at Versailles, was not in the Council Chamber when this question was discussed. The extension had been agreed to between Sir Douglas Haig and General Pétain, and it was actually an accomplished fact before the Council ever met. In fact, contrary to General Maurice's specific charge, not a single yard was taken over as a result of the Versailles Council. Mr. George declared that there was not a word of truth in the suggestion that the War Cabinet had ordered this stretch of line to be taken over, and that the objections of Sir William Robertson and Sir Douglas Haig had been overruled. Neither Sir Douglas Haig nor the War Cabinet was anxious for the extension of the line, and the step was taken only in response to very great pressure from the French. The principles laid down by Sir William Robertson, and accepted by the Cabinet, were that there must be an extension of the line, and that the time and extent must be left to the two Commanders-in-Chief to settle together. It was true that at one time Sir Douglas Haig was under the impression that the Cabinet had taken the decision without his consent, but the misunderstanding was removed by a memorandum from Sir William Robertson. Finally, the Prime Minister pointed the moral of the Maurice incident. He insisted that the letter was a flagrant breach of discipline, and he respectfully suggested that Mr. Asquith ought to have deprecated it. He made an appeal to all sections to end these distracting controversies, which threatened the unity of the Army and the nation. He warned the House that the Germans were silently preparing perhaps the biggest blow of the war. With the fate of the country in the balance now and in the next three weeks, he demanded an end of "this sniping."

Mr. Asquith's motion was rejected by 293 votes to 106, and the incident closed by the decision of the Army Council to place

General Maurice on retired pay, in view of his breach of regulations in publishing his letter. The General thereupon became military correspondent of the *Daily Chronicle*, and later transferred his services to the *Daily News*.

The House now turned its attention to the serious business of continuing legislation. The Education Bill passed through Committee, and during this stage an amendment sanctioning military drill in continuation schools was rejected by a majority of 133. On May 13 a similar fate was meted out to Proportional Representation, which was introduced as a private measure, and advocated a limited experiment at the next general election. On the same day an important announcement on the country's commercial policy was made by Mr. Bonar Law. He informed the House that, in order to leave their country's hands free for the time when peace arrived, the French Government had denounced all commercial conventions containing a general clause regarding "most-favoured nations"; and that, in view of the probable scarcity of raw material after the war and the necessity for providing for the needs of the British Empire and the Allies, the British Government intended to adopt a similar course. In so doing, the British Government had not changed its policy expressed in the Paris resolutions since the entrance of the United States into the war; and Mr. Law declared his belief that America was very anxious for unity of economic control, and agreed that any useful action would be much more effective if taken in conjunction with our Allies.

Finally, a review of the activities of the Board of Trade was given by the President on May 13. Sir Albert Stanley began by pointing out that the decrease in our volume of imports last year, as compared with the last full year of peace, was about 40 per cent., and in that of exports about 30 per cent. Surveying next the general industrial position, he submitted the estimate that more than one-half of all the workpeople then engaged in industry were doing work on Government account, and that the aggregate output of industry was very little less than before the war. This "truly remarkable performance," he acknowledged, could not have been secured without the help of women, of whom there were at least 1,500,000 more in employment than before the war.

Turning to the various forms of control exercised by his department, Sir Albert Stanley declared that it was very remarkable that the railway companies should be carrying more passengers, exclusive of those on military account, than they had ever carried before, and that the goods traffic, again independent of traffic on Government account, should also be heavier than at any time in their history. He therefore pleaded for the need of some reasonable limitation of passenger traffic, even at the expense of individual hardship. On the subject of the new restrictions, he explained that the proposal to increase by 10 per

cent. the price of season tickets issued for journeys within a 12-mile zone, and to add 20 per cent. to the price for journeys beyond that distance, applied to the whole of Great Britain. He mentioned that the number of season tickets issued this year, as compared with last year, had increased by more than 30 per cent., and estimated that the average cost, even after the increase had been made, would work out at less than 4*d.* a mile. He further pointed out that the new charge for the 12-mile zone did not represent an average increase of more than 1*l.* a year. Sir Albert Stanley announced that the whole of Great Britain was also affected by the proposal that no new season tickets should be issued for less than six months, though certain exceptions would be allowed in cases of real hardship. Continuing, Sir Albert stated that if persons, after the surrender of their season tickets within the restricted area, attempted to travel regularly on the railways by taking ordinary tickets, the Board of Trade would have to take steps to prevent their doing so.

No less important was the coal problem. Sir Albert Stanley announced with regret that it would be necessary to go further in reducing the consumption of coal next winter, both for industrial and domestic purposes. A new scheme of coal rationing for the whole country was to be issued very shortly. The Minister intimated that the scheme would take into account the rationing of gas and electricity, so that nobody could substitute one form of fuel for another to his own advantage.

Another topic of interest was that of the paper restrictions, and Sir Albert Stanley estimated that in the current year about half the paper used in this country would be manufactured from home-produced materials, and particularly called attention to a new method of using sawdust for the purpose. Finally, the President of the Board informed the House that in order to make the dyeing industry self-supporting, the Government would assist dye manufacturers by means of loans and grants for research work, and would control by a system of licences for a period of not less than ten years after the war the importation of all foreign dye-stuff.

Scarcely had the House of Commons adjourned for the Whitsun recess (May 16) when trouble broke out in Ireland. The promised Irish Bill was then still in the hands of the Committee of Ministers engaged in drafting it, and the Irish executive had undergone a change: Lord French succeeded Lord Wimborne as Lord-Lieutenant, and Mr. Shortt took the place of Mr. Duke as Chief Secretary. The two new men had not been long in office when a dangerous German intrigue in Ireland was discovered. On May 18 the Lord-Lieutenant posted a Proclamation declaring that it had come to the Irish Government's knowledge that certain of the King's subjects in Ireland had entered into a treasonable communication with the German enemy and that strict measures must be taken to put down this German plot. The Proclamation called on all the King's

subjects in Ireland to aid in crushing the said conspiracy, and concluded :—

“As a means to this end we shall cause still further steps to be taken to facilitate and encourage voluntary enlistment in Ireland in his Majesty’s Forces, in the hope that, without resort to compulsion, the contribution of Ireland to these forces may be brought up to its strength and made to correspond to the contributions of other parts of the Empire.”

The Irish Government made it clear that it had every intention of stamping out the plot, and on the day on which the Proclamation was issued some 150 Sinn Feiners were arrested, not on any specific charge but under the Defence of the Realm Act; and forty-six of the prisoners were immediately taken from Kingstown to Holyhead. The Sinn Fein Headquarters in Dublin were raided, the police carrying off a quantity of books and papers. There was much excitement but no disorder in Dublin. The Government made it known that it would publish such evidence of complicity between the leaders of the Sinn Fein movement and the enemy as could safely be made public, and on May 25 a statement was issued setting forth in detail the story of the attempts of the German Government to foment rebellion in Ireland, and of the preparations made in Ireland to carry these attempts into action. The events dated back as far as November, 1914, and showed that Casement was a prime mover in the plot which resulted in the Irish Rebellion of April 24, 1916. But even after the plot had failed the Sinn Fein leaders were in communication with Germany. In April, 1918, it was definitely ascertained that a plan for landing arms in Ireland was ripe for execution. The British authorities obtained information that a German agent would arrive in Ireland, and when he disembarked, on April 12, he was arrested. The new rising depended largely on the landing of munitions from submarines, and there was evidence to show that it was planned to follow a successful German offensive in the West and to take place at a time when Great Britain would be, presumably, stripped of troops. According to documents found on his person, de Valera had worked out in great detail the constitution of his rebel army, and hoped to be able to muster half a million trained men. There was evidence that German munitions were actually shipped on submarines at Cuxhaven at the beginning of May.

When the House reassembled on May 28, the Government was asked by Mr. King (in the absence of Mr. Dillon) to make a statement on new developments in Ireland, but Mr. Bonar Law declined to do so, and the matter was for the moment allowed to drop.

Much greater interest was shown by the House of Commons on its reassembly in the question of pensions. In reviewing the work of his department, Mr. Hodge stated that the names added to the list of cases weekly showed an average of about 15,000; that the Ministry of Pensions hoped to provide every disabled

soldier with a spare artificial limb ; that the number of disabled men who had received pensions up to the end of April was 341,025 ; and that the Ministry had been endeavouring to set an example to other Government departments in the employment of disabled men, utilising already between 200 and 300. During the debate emphasis was laid on the importance of keeping the administration of pensions free from party organisations.

No less keen was the interest both of the Commons and the Lords in the fate of prisoners of war. In the Lower House Mr. Bonar Law announced that the Government had already entered into negotiations with a view to arranging a wide scheme of exchange of prisoners on lines similar to those of the Franco-German agreement. He made it clear that the negotiations would include the cases of civilian as well as military prisoners. Indeed, there would be no limit to the topics that might be discussed. Lord Devonport introduced the subject in the Upper House, insisting that the country earnestly desired a general exchange of prisoners at the earliest moment. He told the Government that hitherto they had entirely failed to realise the intense feeling of sympathy that had sunk deeply into the minds of the people at home for our much tormented men in Germany. He warned Ministers that they were already impatient at the bare suggestion thrown out by Lord Newton that our men should receive different treatment from the French prisoners, and he declared roundly that no terms inferior to those that France had secured would be acceptable.

Lord Newton who replied explained that the German Government had already suggested a meeting at The Hague in order to discuss matters of acute difficulty which had arisen, and that the British Government had agreed. Lord Curzon, however, warned the public not to expect an immediate rush of exchanged prisoners, emphasising the point made by Lord Newton that the military authorities had not all been converted to the need of exchanging able-bodied combatants.

Of the measures before the House of Commons, the Education Bill continued to occupy a foremost place, and on May 30, during the Committee stage, the House considered clause 10, which was regarded as the crux of the Bill, seeking as it did to establish a compulsory system of continuation education in England and Wales up to the age of 18. According to this clause, a child could either have a full-time education until he was 16 years of age, or put in eight hours a week continuation instruction between the ages of 14 and 18 years. Mr. Peto moved amendments with the object of applying the experiment only to selected children. He contended that the proposal was not fully understood or accepted by the people. He also urged that, if the clause were adopted, it would be difficult to find boys for agriculture, the mercantile marine, and the mills. Mr. Herbert Lewis, speaking for the Government, declined to accept the amendment on the ground that the general character of the

clause was regarded as vital to the Bill. Its main object, he observed, was to prevent the enormous waste of time, energy, and money which resulted from elementary education as now conducted. In his opinion, a considerable part of the 30,000,000*l.* spent on elementary education might as well be thrown into the Thames. Therefore, on economical grounds alone, education should be continued between the ages of 14 and 18. The Government further wished to improve the physique of future generations, and physical training would form an essential part of the instruction in continuation schools. The amendments were negatived, including Sir Henry Hibbert's so-called "Lancashire amendment," which would have allowed, as an alternative to the education prescribed in clause 10, half-time education up to the age of 16, and so removed the "half-timer" in Lancashire and elsewhere from the advantage of adolescent training afforded by the Bill. Mr. Fisher, however, announced two modifications of his original scheme. One was the reduction, under certain circumstances, of the number of hours of attendance yearly from 320 to 280; by the other, young persons over 16 would not be required to attend continuation schools for the next seven years following the appointed day. In this form the Bill ultimately passed both Houses.

When the Committee stage of the Finance Bill was resumed on June 4, the increased stamp duty on cheques came in for much criticism. Sir Charles Henry and other members who objected to the increase based their opposition chiefly on the ground that it would diminish the number of cheques used, and would lead to an undesirable increase in currency notes. Mr. Herbert Samuel calculated, from Mr. Bonar Law's estimate of the yield of the additional duty, that the number of cheques used would be reduced by 50,000,000. He urged that since the tax had been first proposed the opposition had greatly developed, and hoped that Mr. Bonar Law would not insist on it. Mr. James Mason, on the other hand, refused to believe that people would abandon the easy facility of paying small accounts by cheque for the sake of the extra penny.

Mr. Bonar Law, in asking the House to support the Government in upholding the extra duty, argued that there was no danger whatever of inflation. He did not believe that the effect of the increased tax would be any serious diminution in the number of cheques used. He supported his argument by citing the case of newspapers which used to be sold at 1*d.* and now cost 2*d.* Some of those interested had told him that there was a falling off at first, but that now the circulation was back to its old figure. He believed that the same thing would happen in the case of cheques. The House divided and the 2*d.* tax was accepted by 205 votes to 40.

The proposal in the Finance Bill to tax luxuries did not meet with similar approval, possibly because the Treasury appeared not to have a clear-cut scheme. The original proposals under-

went considerable changes, and ultimately Mr. Bonar Law decided to introduce a separate Bill on the subject.

Meanwhile one aspect of the Irish question came to the fore again. On June 3 the Lord-Lieutenant issued a proclamation in which he asked for 50,000 Irish volunteers immediately, to replenish the Irish divisions in the field, and thereafter for 2,000 to 3,000 recruits per month.

"We recognise," the proclamation then continued, "that men who come forward and fight for their Motherland are entitled to share in all that their Motherland can offer. Steps are therefore being taken to ensure as far as possible that land shall be available for men who have fought for their country, and the necessary legislative measure is now under consideration."

This proposal once again directed the attention of Parliament to Ireland. In reply to a request from Sir Edward Carson, Mr. Arthur Samuels, the Solicitor-General for Ireland, on June 12, made a general statement on the subject of Lord French's proclamation offering grants of land to Irish recruits. He explained that the proposed amendment of the Land Purchase Act would secure to ex-soldiers the privileges in regard to the purchase of untenanted land already enjoyed by tenants and proprietors of holdings. It would also extend the provisions for the purchase and settlement of land in relief of congestion to cases of untenanted land in order to provide holdings for such men. It was intended that the proposal should be extended to Irish soldiers who had enlisted at any time during the war.

The House was clearly not satisfied with this statement, and Sir Edward Carson asked the Government for an opportunity of discussing "this very vague proposition."

The Irish question came to a head when on June 20 Lord Curzon announced in the House of Lords that in present circumstances it was out of the question to proceed with a Home Rule Bill which there was not a ghost of a chance of anyone accepting. If they could not have Home Rule, he added, they could not have conscription. This view was supported in the Commons five days later by the Prime Minister during the debate for which Sir Edward Carson had asked. Mr. Lloyd George told the House that there was no doubt the Roman Church as a body in Ireland had associated itself with a challenge to Imperial supremacy. He regarded that as one of the most fatal mistakes that Church had ever made, but it could not be gainsaid that, in view of that attitude, it would have been an act of folly to have attempted to force through a Home Rule Bill. Still, it would be a greater folly to abandon every attempt at a settlement. He declined to deal with the problem in any other spirit than that of hope, and he was persuaded that the former atmosphere of conciliation could be re-created in Ireland.

If Ireland was a contentious topic, the food position at home

gave cause for satisfaction to the House and the country. Mr. Clynes, who had succeeded Lord Rhondda as Food Controller, was able, on June 6, to give the House of Commons a very encouraging report on the food situation, which was much better than in the early summer of 1917. The prospect of increased supplies was also far better now than then. On the subject of meat, he explained that foreign supplies were coming in in large quantities, and that the maintenance of home flocks and herds at substantially the same level as last year was assured. He declared that it was the wish of the Food Ministry to improve the quality of bread. They were looking forward to the prospect of a very good harvest, not merely in this country, but in America and Canada. If those hopes were realised, the colour and quality of bread would be materially improved.

Mr. Clynes gave the House a great deal of detailed information about different articles of food, which may be summarised in the following way:—

Potatoes.—The subsidy, estimated at 5,000,000*l.*, would not exceed more than 1,500,000*l.* In return for that, we had a bountiful crop, amounting to an increase of 680,000 tons on previous years.

Meat.—Eighteen thousand tons were required every week to supply the normal ration. This was made up of 8,000 tons of imported meat and 10,000 tons of home-killed. The country was then at the top of the curve of our supplies of frozen meat.

Bacon and Ham.—Very large supplies had been secured from America, amounting to 457,000 tons up to May 25. The Ministry aimed at building up a reserve stock to be drawn upon in the late summer and early autumn. They had no present intention of lessening the price of bacon, but an Order would be issued, putting the retail price upon a more definite footing, so that the best cuts might be procurable at not more than 2*s.* 4*d.* a lb.

Milk.—At the present season the supply is abundant, Mr. Clynes told the House. In order, however, to safeguard the future, he had decided to meet the demand of the farmers by allowing an increase in price of 4*d.* a gallon from June 10 until the end of September. This would add 1*d.* a quart to the price to the consumer. It had been agreed that the Ministry must become responsible for the wholesale collection, utilisation, and distribution of milk.

Jam.—Practically the whole of this year's fruit crop must be reserved for the jam manufacturers. There was very little prospect of any appreciable quantity being available for ordinary consumption.

Marmalade.—The Ministry had arranged for the whole of the 1917 bitter orange crop of Spain and Sicily to be placed at their disposal for marmalade making.

Margarine.—The productive capacity of the industry in this

country had increased fourfold during the war, so that we were entirely independent of foreign supplies.

Mr. Clynes also emphasised the value of national food kitchens, of which 535 were now in existence. The Ministry were negotiating with local authorities for the establishment of a further 500, but the response from certain centres had been disappointing. He ended his deeply interesting review with a reverent tribute to the men who were braving the perils of the sea to bring food to our shores.

The Chairman of the Sugar Commission, Sir Charles Bathurst, rendered an account of the work of his department. He explained that the stocks then in the country represented roughly about three months' supply. He gave a disquieting forecast of the fruit crop. It was anticipated that there would be very few plums, possibly no pears, and not an average crop of apples. The soft fruit, if not up to the average, promised to be more abundant than the autumn crop. He announced that sugar, which had been intended for the autumn crop, would be issued a month earlier, so that it might be available for the late soft fruit.

Another aspect of the war appeared in the Postmaster-General's annual review, on June 13, of the work of his department. The following were his chief points:—

There were still nearly 80,000 men belonging to the postal service in the Army; 3,000 had been discharged and returned to the Post Office.

Army, Navy, and Air Force allowances and pensions entailed over 4,000,000 counter transactions a week.

Notwithstanding the sale of War Loan and War Savings Certificates, the deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank were 5,000,000*l.* higher than at the beginning of the war.

Air-raid warnings sometimes entailed as many as 10,000 to 20,000 telephone calls.

The soldiers' post to France consisted every week of 10,000,000 letters and 350,000 parcels.

The post for prisoners of war and those interned in neutral countries was 116,000 letters and 126,000 parcels.

The correct London postal address by numbers was found on 54 per cent. of letters.

The tunnel for the London Post Office tube had been completed, but its equipment would not be started until the war was over.

In the debate which followed, Mr. Wiles expressed the hope that before long there would be an aeroplane post between England and Allied countries. Mr. Illingworth was sympathetic, but could not promise any step in this direction until after the war.

This indirect reference to the requirements of the moment was accentuated by Mr. Bonar Law's vote of credit on June 18. The amount was for 500,000,000*l.*, 100,000,000*l.* less than the

last vote, which, it was estimated, would finance the war for three months and that assumption was fairly borne out. The sum asked for would finance the war roughly from the beginning of July to the middle of September. The total amount demanded in votes of credit by the Government from the beginning of the war up till June, 1918, was no less than 7,342,000,000*l.* Mr. Law's financial statement gave the House an opportunity for a general debate on war topics. Dealing first with the Austrian offensive against the Allies on the Italian front, Mr. Law declared that, after three days of fighting, the enemy had not secured the objectives which he hoped to attain on the first day. The attack had failed, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer expressed the admiration and gratitude of the House of Commons for the share which our Italian Allies were taking in the struggle.

He then gave a long appreciation of the continuous battle in France, and again surveyed the position with quiet confidence. He suggested that, if anyone in the early days of the struggle had told Marshal Hindenburg that after three months the position would have been what it then was, he would have treated the prediction with scorn. Mr. Law pointed with satisfaction to two far-reaching results of the German offensive—the establishment of unity of command and the rapid arrival of American troops. He referred to the large number of troops which had been sent from this country to France since March 21 to strengthen our Forces. Still, the main source of Allied reserves was in America—"The American troops are not coming; they have come."

Mr. Law's financial statement on the expenditure up to June 8 may be summarised as follows:—

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Total expenditure - - - - - | £472,500,000 |
| Reduction on estimate - - - - - | 9,500,000 |
| Daily Average - - - - - | 6,848,000 |
| Reduction - - - - - | 138,000 |
| Reduction on fighting Services - - - - - | 15,200,000 |
| Admiralty - - - - - | - 13,500,000 |
| Munitions - - - - - | - 6,000,000 |
| Air Force - - - - - | - 4,000,000 |
| Army - - - - - | + 9,000,000 |
| Advances to Allies - - - - - | 88,000,000 |
| Total for War - - - - - | 1,370,000,000 |
| Advances to Dominions - - - - - | 12,000,000 |
| Total for War - - - - - | 206,000,000 |
| Reduction - - - - - | 15,600,000 |
| Purchase of foodstuffs:— | |
| Increase on estimate (recoverable) - - - - - | 21,000,000 |
| Net decrease in dead-weight expenditure - - - - - | £30,000,000 or £435,000 a day |

Mr. McKenna, who followed, called attention to the fact that the country's total expenditure had reached the enormous figure of 7,750,000*l.* a day. He insisted that it was of vital importance that money should not be wasted, and appealed to the public service to set a good example. On the following day (June 19) the House of Commons took advantage of the report

stage of the Vote of Credit to discuss the burning issue of control of national expenditure.

The duty of raising the question naturally fell to Mr. Herbert Samuel, the Chairman of the Select Committee on National Expenditure. His general conclusion was that the country was suffering very much in having a Chancellor of the Exchequer who was too amiable. He told Mr. Bonar Law that he was not severe enough with the spending departments, and reminded him that during his eighteen months' tenure of office the national expenditure had increased by 50 per cent.

Mr. Bonar Law, in a long defence of the Treasury, indicated the directions in which the Government had met the recommendations of the Select Committee. On the question of staffing he singled out the Ministry of Munitions as the department where on the face of it examination was necessary. He gave an assurance that the cutting down of unnecessary military establishments at home was being dealt with. As for the staffing of the War Office, he agreed that nobody could go there without feeling what an immense lot of people there were there, and wondering what they were doing. But it was not generally realised that the amount of work now done by the War Office was twenty-six times greater than in the first months of the war. The only way to save great sums of money in Mr. Bonar Law's belief, was to get the best business man available, and to make him responsible. He explained, in great detail, what the Government had done in this direction, and pointed specially to Sir Andrew Weir's mission at the War Office. He asked the House to believe that there was something bigger involved than the mistakes which had been pointed out. The real question of the saving of money in the Ministry of Munitions, as in the War Office, was the way in which the big business was done. The real test, he submitted, was the way in which the output was produced and affairs were controlled, and he took that test to show that on the whole the work was being done well.

Mr. Bonar Law concluded with an account of the internal Cabinet changes which Lord Curzon explained in the Upper House that very afternoon. There Lord Middleton urged that the duties of the War Cabinet should be limited to matters immediately relating to the war, and that ordinary Cabinet government should be re-established for all other purposes. He suggested that the present War Cabinet of "half a dozen oligarchs" should be replaced by one consisting of the Prime Minister, representatives of the Army and Navy, a Minister without portfolio, and a representative of the Dominions like General Smuts.

Lord Curzon, in reply, gave a very full and instructive account of the working of the War Cabinet system. He began by claiming that we had never waged a war in which the military advisers of the Government had had a freer mandate in the expression of their views, or in which more deference had been paid to them. After denying that there was congestion under

this plan, he made a striking comparison between the old system and the new. He depicted the old Cabinet as a sort of Star Chamber sitting with closed doors which no one was allowed to penetrate. Now, with the opening of the doors of the Cabinet room, the meetings bore a certain resemblance to an Oriental Durbar. "But," he hastened to add, "there is no ceremonial in either our conference or our conduct."

The Committee on Home Affairs was the latest development of the system. Lord Curzon announced that this Committee, consisting of the principal Home Ministers, would meet at least once a week, under the chairmanship of the Home Secretary. All domestic questions requiring the co-operation of two or more departments and calling for Cabinet decision would be referred to it. The Committee would have the power of decision, on behalf of the Cabinet, but larger questions of policy would be referred, at the discretion of the chairman, to the War Cabinet. He thought the Committee might be a valuable addition to our system. He dismissed the alternative solution of two Cabinets as utterly impossible, and contended from his experience that the present system worked smoothly.

On June 21 the Finance Act was read a third time in the House of Commons without a division. Among the changes introduced into the Act, four deserve special mention :—

1. The grant of 25*l.* relief in respect of a wife on incomes up to 800*l.* was extended to a widower in respect of a female relative of his, or of his deceased wife, resident with him and having charge of any child of his.

2. A person with an income of between 800*l.* and 1,000*l.* should be entitled to 25*l.* relief in respect of each of his children above the number of two.

3. Manufacturers were given a second appeal to referees, the first being to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, on questions relating to depreciation of machinery, if the referees were satisfied that the application was made on behalf of any considerable number of persons engaged in any class of trade or business.

4. The allowance granted in respect of wear and tear of machinery was extended to machinery temporarily out of use through circumstances attributable directly or indirectly to the war.

Mr. Bonar Law declared that no Finance Bill in his time had gone through the House of Commons with so little criticism and with such evidence of good will from every quarter of the House. He claimed that the House, in this respect representing the country, had felt that this was not the time to throw any obstacle in the way of the Government's getting the money necessary to carry on the war.

Mr. Bonar Law was asked when the luxury tax would be introduced. He replied that it all depended on the date on which the Select Committee completed their work. It was a very difficult subject in any case, and it was probable that, even after

the Select Committee had reported, it would be necessary for him to receive deputations. He asked the House clearly to understand that it was his firm intention to carry the luxury tax through.

Another piece of legislation that received attention in June was the new Trade Boards Bill, intended to amend and extend the Act of 1909. The Bill was introduced early in May, and on the motion for the second reading, on June 17, the House participated in a debate on industrial relations in the future.

Mr. George Roberts, the Minister of Labour, explained that the Bill gave power to his department to set up trade boards in any trade in which he considered such a step expedient, having regard to the wages paid in that trade, instead of only in a trade in which the rate of wages was exceptionally low. The trade boards would be given discretionary power to secure a minimum rate of remuneration for piece-workers and to fix differential rates for overtime and Sunday labour. It was further provided that the trade boards might act in the spirit of the Whitley Report by making recommendations to a Government Department with reference to conditions in a trade. It was the Labour Minister's ambition to see the whole of industry covered by industrial councils or wages boards.

Mr. Whitley intervened to explain that the Committee of which he was chairman had looked upon trade boards as necessary in certain cases, but always as a stepping-stone to responsible self-government within an industry. He pointed out that the best way for an industry to minimise the need of a trade board was to go ahead as speedily as possible with the organisation of an industrial council. Mr. James Mason moved the rejection of the Bill, on the ground that it enormously increased the bureaucratic powers of the Ministry of Labour. Lord Henry Bentinck, though not a whole-hearted supporter of the Prime Minister or the Government, declared that their social legislation was conceived in entirely the right spirit.

After a long discussion, Mr. Bridgeman, replying for the Government, said that the Bill was concerned more with women than with men. It was probable, in his view, that large numbers of women now at work would be unemployed after the war. This fact clearly might encourage sweating in certain trades mainly run by women, and the Bill was designed to meet such a situation. In the end the Bill was read a second time without a division.

Meanwhile the question of man-power came up again towards the end of June. The so-called "comb-out" was made far more rigorous. Committees were set up to secure recruits for the Army from the Government Department; 30,000 recruits had been raised from the land; and it was decided to bring back to the country the young men who had hitherto escaped military service by changing their residence from Great Britain to Ireland. The Prime Minister told the House on

June 27 that while it was true that the Americans were coming, and were prepared to be brigaded with our divisions, this was on the distinct understanding that, when the new comb-out materialised, the men who came in would take the places of the Americans, so that they could form their own divisions. That was the honourable understanding on which President Wilson was prepared to send a very large force of Americans to France to be brigaded with the British forces.

Important as were these peace and war problems of domestic policy, their significance was only matched by the tasks which came before the second Imperial War Cabinet. On June 7 the following official statement was issued:—

“It will be remembered that, in the early part of 1917, the representatives of the self-governing Dominions and of India were invited to confer with His Majesty’s Government on matters affecting the prosecution of the war, and on the problems which would arise on its termination. With this object in view a series of special meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet took place, and concurrently an Imperial War Conference was held at the Colonial Office, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

“This year similar invitations have been given by His Majesty’s Government, and the representatives of the self-governing Dominions and India have, for the most part, now arrived in the United Kingdom. It is expected that the meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet and Conference will begin within the next few days.

“The Prime Minister of Canada, Sir R. L. Borden, G.C.M.G., who was present at last year’s meetings, is also attending this year. He is accompanied by three of his colleagues in the Canadian Cabinet—namely, Mr. A. Meighen, Minister of the Interior, Mr. J. Calder, Minister of Immigration and Colonisation, and Mr. N. Rowell, President of the Privy Council. Of the three latter Ministers, Mr. Meighen was formerly Solicitor-General, whilst Mr. Calder and Mr. Rowell joined the Canadian Government when Sir R. Borden reconstituted his Ministry at the end of 1917.

“Last year, owing to unavoidable circumstances, the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia could not be represented, but on this occasion Mr. W. M. Hughes, Prime Minister, and Mr. Joseph Cook, Minister of the Navy, will attend.

“New Zealand will have the same representatives as last year—namely, Mr. W. F. Massey, Prime Minister, and Sir Joseph Ward, Minister of Finance.

“The Union of South Africa will be represented by Lieut.-General J. C. Smuts and Mr. H. Burton, K.C., Minister of Railways and Harbours.

“Newfoundland will be represented by Mr. W. F. Lloyd, K.C., who succeeded Lord Morris as Prime Minister at the end of 1917.

"India will be represented in the Imperial War Cabinet and the Imperial War Conference by the Secretary of State for India and by Sir Satyendra P. Sinha, the representative of India nominated by the Viceroy in accordance with the undertaking given by Mr. Lloyd George in the House of Commons in May, 1917.

"His Majesty's Government also requested the Viceroy, as in 1917, to invite a ruling Prince to attend the War Conference as representative of the Indian States, and the invitation has been accepted by his Highness the Maharaja of Patiala, G.C.I.E., G.B.E."

The Imperial War Cabinet and the Imperial Conference held their first sessions on June 11, but as was the case last year, no report of the proceedings of the former was issued to the public. An occasion for publicly emphasising the importance of these gatherings was, however, provided by the Parliamentary supper, at which the overseas visitors were entertained by the Empire Parliamentary Association, in the Royal Galleries of the House of Lords, on Friday, June 21. The Lord Chancellor presided, and the Prime Minister, in proposing the toast of "our Cabinet Colleagues from the Dominions," extended a hearty welcome to the visitors. "We welcome our guests," he said, "not merely for what they are, but for what they represent. They represent a good deal to us. They represent a consciousness of Empire, and of a great Empire, and at a moment when a terrible enemy is compassing the destruction of our native land we may be forgiven for having almost uppermost in our minds that our guests represent a real help to our country at our moment of real need. We know that their people are fighting for the cause of Empire and right, which they deem as sacred as we do; but we also know that they came more readily, more eagerly, more speedily into the fight because the Old Country had got herself into trouble through her championship of that cause. There are legends in history, striking legends, of children who turned on their parents in the hour of tribulation. One of the greatest stories of the ages henceforth will be the story of a Motherland, beset by cruel foes, whose children rushed from the ends of the earth to shield her with their sturdy strength."

While the Imperial War Cabinet and the Imperial Conferences were in session another great and important gathering was being held in London, from June 26 to 28—the first Annual Meeting of the British Labour Party under its new constitution (cf. p. 70). The provisional agenda for the Conference consisted of twenty-seven resolutions based on the pamphlet, "Labour and the New Social Order," which was published earlier in the year by the Executive of the party. Taken together, the resolutions formed a comprehensive and far-reaching programme of political, industrial, economic, and social reforms, designed to rebuild society on an approved democratic basis. The Executive Committee also invited the party to abandon the political truce.

To this considerable opposition developed, and before the Conference the Labour members of the Government issued a manifesto in which they complained that their position was rendered difficult on account of the "incessant sniping on the part of anti-national factionalists," and pleaded for national unity. "For the moment," the eight signatories of the manifesto wrote, "we believe that national unity is the one supreme consideration. But there is another consideration present to our mind. We are Labour representatives. We are desirous of maintaining the solidarity of Labour. We look forward to the time when there must be a rebuilding of the social and industrial fabric. In order that Labour may then exert its due influence it is necessary that Labour should be a united body. There are, however, ominous signs of division. We regret it, but we regard it as the inevitable outcome of the course of conduct, to which we have referred, on the part of certain persons who have assumed a right to speak for Labour but who fail, we believe, to realise the momentous issues involved in the war."

But this appeal was ineffective. When on the first day of the Conference the resolution "that the existence of the political truce should be no longer recognised" was put, the voting showed 951,000 for the truce and 1,704,000 against, being a majority against of 753,000 votes. In initiating the discussion on the resolution, Mr. Henderson explained that it was intended only to regularise the position of the party, in view of the insistence of constituent organisations on promoting Labour candidates against Coalition nominees at by-elections. It did not imply, he argued, that the Labour members of the Government must withdraw from office. It was dangerous to break a Government in war-time without knowing what was the policy of its successors. Mr. Barnes opposed the resolution, declaring that it would inevitably involve, as the next step, the severance of Labour from the Coalition. Mr. Clynes was also against the motion. He contended that freedom of action at by-elections was not incompatible with the retention of a share in the burdens of responsibility. He called on those who clamoured for withdrawal to say whether their purpose was to weaken or to strengthen the Government for the prosecution of the war, and he offered to resign his seat and exchange constituencies with any member who believed that the rank and file of Labour wanted a breach with the Government.

Despite the vote, the Labour members did not withdraw from the Government. Mr. Henderson announced that 306 Labour candidates had been, or were being, allotted to constituencies, and that inquiries had been received on the question of contesting a further 100 seats at the next General Election.

The Conference was not without its surprises. A number of foreign delegates—MM. Renaudel, Longuet, and Thomas, from France, Vandervelde from Belgium, and Branting from Sweden—attended the Conference and spoke. But on the first day a

sensation was caused by the unexpected appearance of M. Kerensky, the Socialist Ex-Prime Minister of Russia, who received an ovation. On the following day M. Kerensky gave the Conference a plain statement of the piteous position of Russia and pleaded for sympathy. After listening to the speeches of the other foreign visitors the Conference settled down to the consideration of the programme of social and economic reforms, the whole of which was adopted practically in its original form.

This included declarations that inefficiency and waste should be eliminated in order to increase the national output, that trade union conditions should be restored after the war, that a ten years' programme of national and local government works should be prepared for the prevention of unemployment, that education should be nationalised and the poor law abolished, that there should be conscription of wealth, and that a national housing scheme should be adopted. It is of interest to observe that even before this programme was published the Government had already promised Treasury help for housing (May 2). Speaking on the vote for the Local Government Board, Mr. Hayes Fisher made a detailed statement on the housing programme of the Government. The Local Government Board, he explained, had laid their plans on the assumption that the cost of building houses by private enterprise after the war would be prohibitive, so far as any profit could be derived from any rents which the working classes would be willing or able to pay. The replies to recent official circulars indicated the probable need of 300,000 houses. He was able to announce that about 900 local authorities had intimated their willingness to provide more than 150,000 houses. Those authorities added that something, but not much, might be expected from private enterprise. Mr. Hayes Fisher indicated that there was to be a kind of partnership in this matter between local authorities and the Government. The Treasury had agreed to find 75 per cent. of the estimated deficit, leaving 25 per cent. to be borne by the ratepayers—in any case not more than a penny rate. The local authorities had been informed that the department would expect that there should not be more than twelve houses to every acre in an urban district, and not more than eight in a rural district. He stated that the class of house to be provided would consist of a living room, scullery, parlour, and three bedrooms, and the rent would be fixed by the local authority, in consultation with the Board, at rates which the people could reasonably be expected to pay.

The Labour Party's programme also demanded the removal of Government control as soon as conditions should permit. This control was exercised in many directions. Thus when the promised Committee of Inquiry into Bank Fusions (see p. [55]) published its report on May 21, it recommended that future amalgamations should not be permitted without official sanction. Both the Treasury and the Board of Trade were to be consulted, and the Committee advocated legislation which should require

both these departments to set up special statutory bodies to advise them. But this was a comparatively small matter when compared with food control. The principal articles of consumption continued in the second quarter of the year to be rationed either as to price or as to available amounts per head of the population. Meat in particular was strictly controlled, though the rations tended to increase. From April 7 onward it became impossible to buy meat from a retailer or to take a meat meal in a restaurant except on production of a meat card from which the appropriate coupons were detached. But while at first the rationing scheme covered meat in every form, including bacon, edible offal, and bones, before long the latter could be obtained without a coupon; and the quantity of rationed meat that might be purchased in respect of one coupon was increased from five-pennyworth to eight-pennyworth. Tea was rationed; six pounds of sugar was the amount allotted to private fruit growers for domestic jam-making; and the prices of tobacco and matches were fixed. Milk was not rationed, but the price was made to vary according to the season. Under the order of March 8, the maximum retail price was fixed at 2s. 8d. per imperial gallon during April, at 2s. during May, June, and July, and at 2s. 4d. during August and September. The potato acreage of the country for the year 1918 was expected to exceed that of 1917 by about 25 per cent. The total was returned as approximately 900,000 acres, and the hope was nursed that the complete million acres for which the Prime Minister had appealed (see p. [57]) would be reached. The Food Controller made the announcement of these preliminary returns, and assured all growers that they need have no fear of loss, as the Ministry of Food would purchase the entire crop, apart from what was needed on the farms. Nor did the satisfactory potato acreage stand alone. Returns from over the whole country of corn areas showed that the total acreage in the United Kingdom under wheat, barley, and oats in 1918 was expected to be the highest on record. The condition of the crops was said to be promising and an average yield was expected. Great efforts were made to replace by voluntary labour the 30,000 young men who were called to the colours from the land. Public School boys were appealed to, and over 10,000 offers were received for periods varying from fifteen days to one month. The Prime Minister also urged women to come forward in an appeal issued on June 25.

To the Women of Great Britain.

“The fields are ripening for the sickle; the toil of the winter and the spring is earning its reward. This is no ordinary harvest; in it is centred the hope and the faith of our soldiers that their own heroic struggle will not be in vain. In the days before the war the whole world was our granary. Now not only are thousands of men fighting, instead of tilling our own fields,

but the German submarines are trying to starve us by sinking the ships which used to carry to our shores the abundant harvests of other lands.

"Women have already served the Allies by their splendid work upon the farms, but the Army in France has asked for still more men from the land to come and help their brothers in the desperate battle for freedom. These men must go; women will be first to say it. But the harvest is in danger for want of the work these very men would have done. Once again, therefore, as often before, I appeal to women to come forward and help. They have never failed their country yet; they will not fail her at this grave hour. There is not a moment to lose.

"Every woman who has the great gifts of youth and strength, if not already devoting these to essential work for her country, should resolve to do so to-day. If she lives in a village, let her go out and work in the fields from her home. If she can give her whole time, let her join the ranks of the Land Army. From the nearest employment exchange she can learn all about the conditions of service.

"I have watched with deep interest and admiration the splendid work already done. Never have British women and girls shown more capacity or more pluck. And just as the soldiers have asked for thousands more men to come and help them to win the war, so do these brave women in the villages and in the Land Army call to other women to come and help them save the harvest.

"I know this appeal will be heard. Ask the women who have already shown the way what they feel; they will declare that work in the fair fields of our green island is a privilege as well as a duty.

"D. LLOYD GEORGE."

Another step undertaken by the Food Controller was the establishment of National Kitchens. Isolated experiments had been made in various localities from time to time during the early months of the year, and by the beginning of June a considered scheme for the whole country was announced. It was intended to parcel out the country into districts coinciding with the areas of the Food Commissioners, and to make a Divisional Director responsible for each district. The kitchen at Poplar was to be treated as a model, since its success showed how much might be achieved by effective management, modern equipment, and business methods. It had been established in March, and after allowing for cost of management, rent, interest on and redemption of capital, renewal of plant and contingent liabilities, the enterprise showed a profit at the rate of 50 per cent. per annum. Obviously waste had been reduced to a minimum. The number of patrons had steadily increased. The number of portions served in the first few weeks was about 1,000 per day, and grew to over 2,300 per day. The patrons

included mothers, children, school-teachers, bank clerks, commercial clerks, and artisans. An attractive feature of this kitchen was the restaurant which was attached. The number of portions served in the restaurant during its first few weeks was 30 to 40 per day, and it soon reached 300 per day, a sum of 8*l.* per week being realised from charges for table money of 1*d.* for a dinner and $\frac{1}{4}$ *d.* for tea. The eating house which the National Kitchen's Division of the Food Ministry was fitting up in New Bridge Street, Blackfriars, on similar lines to that at Poplar, was expected to be open to the public about the middle of June. A National Kitchen Handbook was also prepared by the Ministry, setting out for the use of the local authorities, and those who would be responsible for the organisation and administration of the kitchens, the methods necessary to ensure success.

As with food, so with clothes. A system of providing standard clothes for civilian males was inaugurated during June. The prices were fixed by the Government and the goods turned out under the Board of Control of Textile Industries. To begin with goods to the total value of about 15 millions sterling were arranged for. No public money was involved, the woollen trade financing the whole scheme. It was estimated that the consumer would be saved at least a third of the cost to which he would be put in buying the clothes under the ordinary prevailing commercial conditions. The prices, according to the grade of cloth, were fixed as follows:—

Men's suits, 84*s.* and 57*s.* 6*d.*; youths' suits, 70*s.* and 50*s.*, boys' suits, 45*s.* and 40*s.*; and men's, youths', and boys' overcoats respectively, 63*s.*, 45*s.*, and 35*s.*

The regulation of food and of clothing, though it may have been inconvenient, was tolerated by the public as a necessary concomitant of the war. But the restrictions on railway travelling announced by Sir Albert Stanley in the House of Commons, produced much popular discontent. The issue of season tickets was limited; power was given to the Board of Trade to restrict booking facilities and the issue of return tickets; and the reduction of train services commenced in April was carried still further in May. The London and Suburban Railway Passengers' Association organised a Mass Meeting of all persons travelling to London for business purposes, who, it was alleged, suffered severely by the restrictions. Other Railway Travellers' Protection Societies sprang up. But though the protests were loud the Government adhered to their scheme which was not modified until after the announcement of the armistice.

The story of the first half of the year would be incomplete without reference to the air raids, of which there were six. On February 16 hostile aeroplanes killed 11 people and injured 4; on February 17 the casualties were 19 killed and 34 injured. On the night of Thursday, March 7, when there was no moon, hostile aeroplanes did some material damage, and killed 11 and

injured 46 people in London. These three raids were on the capital and the south-eastern districts; the fourth, on March 12, was by air-ships, which made the Yorkshire coast their target. Exactly a month later, on April 12, Zeppelins raided the Midlands; and on May 20, on the evening of Whit Monday, when there was a perfect moon, "a considerable number of Gotha aeroplanes" were responsible for 198 casualties in London. This was characterised as one of the most determined raids attempted by the Germans. The sixth air raid occurred on the night of Sunday, May 19, and these were the last attempts on the country by the enemy from the air.

The effect of the air raids, the food situation, the inconveniences of travelling, and the general atmosphere created by the war may have been responsible for the morbid interest in what *The Times* called "A Scandalous Trial" which came to an end on June 4. The action arose from an indecent paragraph in an insignificant journal conducted by Mr. Pemberton Billing, M.P., with the object, as he practically boasted, of forcing exposures by means of libel. In this particular instance the primary object of his attack was Miss Maud Allan and her performance of Oscar Wilde's play "Salome." But the case very soon developed into a whole series of promiscuous innuendoes, in which pro-Germanism was united with every sort of unnatural vice, against many thousands of English men and women, including Mr. Justice Darling himself, who was the Judge in the case. The bone of contention—the estimate of "Salome" as a play—was overshadowed by the mysterious German "Black Book" mentioned by several witnesses, including Mrs. Villiers-Stuart, as a sinister compilation of names in this country likely to be useful to the Germans. The Jury's verdict was in favour of Mr. Billing. But it may be of interest to note that three months later Mrs. Villiers-Stuart was sentenced for bigamy to nine months' imprisonment without hard labour.

CHAPTER III.

ALARMS AND FEARS.

THE five weeks from July 1 to August 8, when Parliament adjourned at the end of its eighth session, marked a period of intense feeling both at Westminster and in the country. The war was approaching a crisis; the German offensives were being delivered on a continuously larger scale; and Marshal Foch was preparing his counter-stroke which brought victory to the Allies. The anti-German sentiment of the country came to a head in the stringent treatment of enemy aliens, and the general feeling of restiveness also affected labour. In view of the seriousness of the times the celebration by the King and Queen, on Saturday, July 6, of the twenty-fifth anniversary of

their wedding-day though impressive was simple. The royal couple attended a special service at St. Paul's at which many of their distinguished subjects were present, as well as a number of wounded sailors and soldiers. Their journey from Buckingham Palace to the Church was witnessed by large crowds along the whole route, and the entry into the City was marked by the traditional ceremony. The Lord Mayor, Sheriffs, and Members of the Corporation awaited the procession at Temple Bar, and when the royal carriage arrived, the Lord Mayor advanced, with reversed mace, and surrendered the pearl Sword of State to the King, who returned it. At St. Paul's the Archbishop of Canterbury delivered the address, and after the service the King and Queen proceeded to the Guildhall where they received an address from the City Corporation and silver wedding gifts from the citizens, consisting of a cheque for 53,000*l.*, to be devoted to any charities selected by themselves, together with a silver tankard once in the possession of Charles II., and given by him to a distinguished citizen in 1678. The ceremony took place in the historic hall, with its statues and monuments of Chatham, Nelson, Pitt, and Wellington. The Lord Mayor (Sir Charles A. Hanson) and the Sheriffs received the King and Queen and the other members of the Royal Family in the Art Gallery. Bouquets were presented to the Queen by the Lady Mayoress, to Queen Alexandra by Mrs. Rowland Blades, wife of the senior Sheriff, and to Princess Mary by Miss Rosalind Hanson, granddaughter of the Lord Mayor.

In the Great Hall the Recorder read the following address :—

"May it please your Majesties—We, your Majesties' dutiful and loyal subjects, the Lord Mayor, aldermen and commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled, humbly approach your Majesties with the liveliest sentiments of loyalty and devotion to present our heartfelt congratulations on the celebration of your silver wedding. It was in 1786 that your illustrious ancestors, King George III. and Queen Charlotte, observed a similar anniversary amid the rejoicings of their loyal subjects. No such event has since occurred in the case of the reigning Sovereign. The citizens of London have regarded with deep satisfaction and affectionate interest the domestic felicity which has been the outstanding feature of your Majesties' wedded life and has been at once an example and an inspiration to all your subjects throughout your vast dominions. The sorrows which have followed in the train of this terrible war are very great, but your loyal subjects gratefully recognise, and have derived much comfort from, the all-absorbing interest which your Majesties have taken in every phase of this world-wide tragedy

"By visits to your soldiers at the front, to the Grand Fleet, to the wounded sufferers in our hospitals, and to the noble army of men and women who have been working day and night to supply the necessities of our forces in the field, on the sea, and

in the air, you have shown your solicitude and concern for their welfare, and from castle and cottage alike prayers have ascended to Almighty God that success may attend our arms and blessings be showered upon your Royal House. So, too, the citizens of London have seen with genuine pleasure and gratification the great anxiety which your Majesties have always shown for the social happiness and welfare of your people—notably in the housing of the working classes, in which our late beloved Sovereign King Edward took so paternal an interest in questions connected with the well-being of the children of the people, and, indeed, in every scheme having for its object the amelioration of the conditions of life of all classes of the community. We know how deep the sympathy of your Majesties has been with the sufferers in the many air raids which have been made upon the Metropolis of the Empire—attacks which have had no effect upon the military situation, but merely resulted in wicked and wanton destruction of life and property. If there have been moments of depression and discouragement in the course of this great war, this human weakness has soon given place to a courageous and uncomplaining spirit, for we have been sustained by the lofty example which your Majesties, living in our midst and sharing in all the fluctuating incidents of these perilous times, have ever set before us.

“The active and heroic services of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales at the front since the commencement of the war, his gallant bearing and his chivalry, have won for him the admiration of all ranks of the Army, the confidence of the Empire, and the affection of our Allies. The citizens of London highly appreciate the honour which your Majesties have done them by your presence to-day in our ancient Guildhall, accompanied as you are by Her Royal Highness the Princess Mary, whose coming of age this year gives additional lustre to this interesting anniversary. We would desire, in conclusion, most respectfully to renew the heartfelt assurance of our loyal and dutiful regard, and pray that your Majesties, and your Family, may long be spared to enjoy true happiness when the clouds which now darken the heavens have passed away and it has pleased God to restore to the world the blessings of a real and lasting peace.”—Signed by order of the Court. James Bell, Town Clerk.

The King's reply, delivered in a loud, clear voice, was in the following terms :—

“I thank you very heartily for your loyal address. It has given the Queen and myself great pleasure to come again to the City of London, which has so many associations with my family, and to receive your congratulations and good wishes on the twenty-fifth anniversary of our wedding day. We are greatly touched by the kind references which you have made to the happiness of our married life, a happiness which has been so much increased by the unfailing sympathy and affection of our

people. We acknowledge with gratitude to Almighty God the many blessings bestowed upon us during these years.

"This anniversary falls at a time when the shadow of war lies heavily on our land, and the very existence of the Empire is assailed by an unscrupulous foe. In this time of trial, it is our earnest desire to share the sorrows of our people, and, so far as in us lies, to alleviate their suffering. But while our hearts are heavy at the thought of the bereavement and distress which have befallen the nation, we have seen with joyful gratitude the whole-hearted response to the call of duty which has reverberated throughout the Empire. And here in the presence of the distinguished representatives of the Dominions and Colonies and the Empire of India, I warmly acclaim the noble and self-sacrificing spirit in which our brothers across the seas have given their best in our united defence of liberty and right. Through four long years of unceasing conflict the ancient qualities of the British race have shown themselves in innumerable heroic deeds and in a dogged endurance, which have baffled the purpose of the enemy.

"From the visits which I have made to the sailors in our fleets and the soldiers in our armies, I have brought back an ever-increasing admiration for the spirit which pervades all ranks, for their resolution and cheerfulness in all circumstances. What words can express the debt we owe to the Navy, which, with unsleeping watchfulness and through every kind of difficulty and danger, has protected our shores and kept open for us and for our Allies the highways of the sea; to the splendid Army, the very flower of the nation, which has stood and still stands as a wall between us and the fury of our enemies; and to our Air Force, distinguished by so many glorious achievements, and now the third arm of the defences of the Empire, of which I am proud indeed to be the General-in-Chief. And when we think of the great fighting services, let us remember too the unflinching gallantry and determination of the men of the merchant service, who have refused to be dismayed by a terrorism hitherto unknown in naval warfare; and the courage of the mine sweepers, trawlers, and fleet auxiliaries, who have performed without ceasing their perilous tasks.

"And a hearty tribute of praise is due to the services of my troops on those more distant fronts which I have been unable to visit in person. The men who are fighting in Italy by the side of our gallant Allies; the Army of Salonika which has so long helped to keep the enemy from the waters of the Eastern Mediterranean; the East African force, which has performed feats of courage and endurance in difficult conditions of climate and locality; the armies of Mesopotamia and Palestine, which have rescued once rich and famous territories from the tyranny which has devastated and depopulated them, and have restored already something of their ancient prosperity—all these have abundantly earned our gratitude and admiration.

"The conditions at home also give cause for pride and thankfulness. We have seen a ready acceptance by all classes, men and women alike, of the burdens which the war has brought, courage in times of crisis, calmness and self-possession when by his air attacks the enemy sought to terrify the non-combatant population of this great City, and at all times an unfaltering determination to persevere to the end in the maintenance of our righteous cause. I would recall in particular the efforts so successfully made, in which the City of London has played such a great part, to uphold and enhance the financial credit of the country and to raise the vast sums needed for the prosecution of the war.

"Especially have I been struck on our visits to the industrial districts of the country, by the evidence in so many quarters of a spirit of mutual concession animating both employers and workers in regard to matters affecting their individual interests, and a readiness to sink differences in order that the essential work of the country should be carried on. We may cherish, I believe, well-founded hopes that in the furnace of war new links of understanding and sympathy are being forged between man and man, between class and class; and that we are coming to recognise as never before that we are all members of one community, and that the welfare of each is dependent upon, and inseparable from, the welfare of all.

"We thank you for your kind references to the Prince of Wales, whose knowledge of our fellow-countrymen has been increased in the comradeship of war, and to our dear daughter. It has been a source of gratification to the Queen and myself that our children have been able to bear some part in the great task to which the country has been called. We are deeply moved by the manifestations of good will which have been so abundantly displayed towards us. We rejoice to feel that we are united with the people of the whole Empire in their ideals and aspirations, in their joys and sorrows, determined to secure such a peace as will save the generations to come from the sufferings, horrors, and desolation inflicted upon the world during the past four years.

"When that peace comes, may it dawn upon an Empire strengthened in character by the fiery trial through which it has passed, and knit together more closely by the memory of common efforts and common sacrifices."

But while the King and Queen accepted a personal gift to mark the day from the citizens of London, and from them only, the congratulations of the peoples of the Empire were voiced by Parliament in the following resolution, which in the House of Commons (on July 8) was moved by the Prime Minister, and seconded by Mr. Asquith, and in the House of Lords was moved by Lord Curzon and seconded by Lord Crewe:—

"That a humble address be presented to their Majesties to congratulate them on the twenty-fifth anniversary of their wedding;

"And to assure their Majesties that this House, deeply interested in the personal well-being of the Sovereign, and warmly appreciating their Majesties' unfailing devotion to duty in this time of stress, profoundly shares the sentiments of loyal affection with which their peoples throughout the world welcome the anniversary of so felicitous a union ;

"And joins with them in praying earnestly for the continuance during many years of their Majesties' health and happiness."

Both Houses of Parliament were much occupied during July with the question of the treatment of enemy aliens. Feeling against the latter had been gradually gathering strength in the country. Municipal Corporations, including that of the city of London, demanded more drastic measures against these unfortunate people ; members of Parliament put down a large number of questions to ministers on the subject ; and demonstrations in Hyde Park and elsewhere were organised to call public attention to the matter. Popular feeling on what was termed the " Enemy Alien Peril " was perhaps best expressed in a motion adopted by the Stepney Borough Council, declaring that enemy aliens over eighteen should be interned, repatriated, or employed on national duties, and that no aliens should be permitted to open or acquire the businesses of an Englishman, relinquished owing to the national crisis, and urging the authorities to take steps forthwith. So loud did public opinion become that towards the end of June the Prime Minister, greatly concerned, asked six members of Parliament drawn from the Unionist, Liberal, and Labour Parties, most of whom had been long agitating on the subject—Mr. Kennedy Jones, Mr. Joynson-Hicks, Sir Henry Dalziel, Sir Richard Cooper, Sir John Butcher, and Mr. Bowerman—to make a thorough investigation of the various phases of the enemy alien question and to advise him as to what action should be taken to allay public anxiety. Meanwhile members became impatient, and as early as July 2 Sir Henry Dalziel, at question-time, asked whether an early opportunity would be provided for a discussion of Government control of enemy aliens. Mr. Bonar Law replied that he hoped it might be possible to give a day the following week. " I know," he said, " how strong feeling on the subject is in the House, and the sooner it is discussed the better."

On July 8 the Committee of Six presented their report to the Prime Minister, which, they said, represented their considered views on the position of aliens in this country and on the scope and character of the action which should be taken by the Government in dealing with the problem. In making their recommendations the Committee were careful to add that " any wholesale charge of treason against such persons [*i.e.*, persons of enemy origin] is unwarranted." The recommendations, fifteen in number, included the wholesale internment of all male enemy aliens over eighteen, allowing for exceptions on national or medi-

cal grounds ; the repatriation of alien women of enemy origin, but providing for exemptions on grounds of justice and humanity ; the review of naturalisation certificates granted to persons of enemy origin ; the immediate discharge from Government offices of all persons, male or female, of enemy origin ; the rendering inoperative until six months after the signing of peace of all changes of name since August 1, 1914, by persons of enemy origin ; and the immediate winding up of enemy businesses and the closing of enemy banks.

On the same day as the report was issued a debate on the aliens question in the House of Lords was opened by Lord Beresford, who spoke of the irritation and anxiety prevailing in the country on the subject, and complained that the Government had never put forward a clear and definite policy. Lord Buckmaster set himself against the main current of opinion, and declared that although it had been suggested that German influence permeated society and influenced Parliament, not a case had been quoted which in the least justified the allegations. But several Liberal peers dissociated themselves from these views, except Lord Parmoor who pleaded that naturalised aliens were entitled to the benefits which naturalisation gave them.

The Committee's recommendations were favourably received by members of the House of Commons, who on July 11 had an opportunity of discussing the whole question on a Government motion to adjourn the House. Sir George Cave, the Home Secretary, opened the debate, and surveyed one aspect after another of the subject as it had been presented to the Prime Minister and the public by the recent report of the six members of Parliament. He recognised the prevailing anxiety in the public mind, but attributed it to a great extent to insufficient knowledge of the steps already taken against an alien danger. In a persuasive defence of the Home Office, he claimed that no ill consequences had occurred as a result of the present system. Incidentally, he revealed the interesting fact that, except in the first few weeks of the war, spies had not been found among subjects of enemy States, but among other nationalities. In submitting his proposals for tightening up the system, he took the ground that, while the Government must take into account public feeling, they must not be pressed by it, however strong, into doing something unfair and unjust. But the Government intended to take new measures. All certificates of exemption from internment were to be revised. The duty of revision was to be undertaken by the old Advisory Committees for England and Scotland ; but these were to be strengthened by additional members, including at least one military man in each case, " who will be able to take the military point of view." Certificates of naturalisation granted during the war were also to be revised. This task was to be undertaken by a judicial committee. A new rule was to be laid down about Government servants that " no person shall during the war be employed

in a Government office unless he is a child of natural-born subjects of this country or of an Allied country," but exceptions were to be allowed "where there is a definite national reason for making an exception." Another small committee was to be set up to decide whether such reasons existed in individual cases. Further, new measures were to be taken to secure the identification of aliens. Every alien, friendly or neutral, was to "have his identity book, and can be challenged to show it." Shipping was to be provided to rid the country, by deportation, of undesirable aliens of all kinds. The German branch banks were to be wound up at once, and legislation was to be introduced to make it impossible to open any enemy bank here for a period of years after the war. Finally, there were to be far more drastic restrictions on changes of name by persons who were not natural-born British subjects, and these changes were to be made retrospective; while the present practice of accepting patent specifications by German subjects was to be discontinued.

It was generally held that these proposals amounted to a complete acceptance of the recommendations of the Committee of Six, and Mr. Lloyd George's speech only strengthened that view. The Prime Minister told the House that he had given a good deal of attention to the matter during the last few weeks, because he considered it was of grave concern affecting the prosecution of the war. What really mattered now, he declared, was that each of the Home Secretary's propositions should be carried out vigorously, "even rigorously," but with absolute fairness. He insisted that the existence of a deep sentiment on the subject in the public mind was the Germans' own fault. He narrated how at every British set-back he received anonymous letters written by Germans in this country, crowing over us. The Prime Minister regarded the argument for a revision of the exemptions from internment as very strong. There was no doubt in his mind that the facts were of such a kind as to make us feel a little anxious about the presence of aliens in positions where they could do harm. He asked members and those outside who had evidence to place it at the disposal of the proper Department, which would examine each case from the standpoint that in time of war the country should have the benefit of the doubt. The only limit he set was that he would not enter into competition with Germany in inhumanity and injustice.

The House of Commons returned to the subject on the following day on the second reading of the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Bill, which had been introduced early in May. Sir George Cave, who was in charge of the measure, explained that its main purpose was to introduce wider powers of revoking certificates of naturalisation and to provide machinery for the purpose. Under the existing law, certificates could only be revoked if they had been obtained by false representation or fraud. It was now proposed to extend that power:—

(1) In cases of disloyalty; (2) in cases of serious criminal offence or of bad character; and (3) where a person acted contrary to the declaration which he made when he was naturalised.

The Home Secretary announced that it was proposed to amend the Bill by inserting an express direction that a certificate granted since the beginning of the war should be subject to review, and might be revoked. He did not think, however, that that direction should apply to British-born persons. The measure, he stated, had been approved in principle by the Imperial Conference in 1917, and the draft had since been approved by India and the self-governing Dominions, except Australia, which, however, had indicated no dissent. He hoped that the difficulties in the way of making the law of nationality uniform throughout the Empire would now be overcome, and he proposed to refer the question very shortly to a conference of experts.

Mr. Herbert Samuel, Sir George Cave's predecessor at the Home Office, gave a very cordial welcome to the Bill, and emphasised the need for wider powers for the Home Secretary. Sir Willoughby Dickinson called attention to the fact that the Bill raised in an acute form the question of the nationality of married women. The Home Secretary, he declared, would have the extraordinary power of saying whether the wife of a naturalised British subject should or should not lose her nationality. He announced that he would move in Committee an amendment to safeguard any British-born woman from being converted into a German, Austrian, or Chinese. Another point which he submitted for consideration was whether a woman who married an alien should lose her nationality against her will. That was the present state of the law, and he claimed that the great mass of women strongly disapproved of it. An amendment affording relief to British wives of denaturalised aliens was eventually incorporated into the Bill during the Committee stage. A number of other amendments were adopted tending to make the provisions of the Bill more stringent. Before the Bill finally passed through the House of Commons it afforded an opportunity to Sir Edward Carson to express dissatisfaction with the government policy which in his opinion was not far-reaching enough. He thought that a Bill might have been produced which should have gone to the root of the matter, and called attention to many aspects of naturalisation with which Ministers had omitted to deal. These included the summoning of naturalised enemy aliens to the Privy Council, their election to the House of Commons, and their presence in Government Departments. He contended that these things made the country doubtful of the earnestness of the Government in getting rid of the penetration of enemy aliens into the very vitals of the country. His last word to the Government was that the people were determined more and more to keep the British Empire for the British people.

Sir George Cave, in reply, dismissed a great deal of the criticism as not germane to the Bill. He argued against the setting up of a special Ministry to deal with enemy aliens, and warmly defended his administration of the Home Office. He claimed that he had done his duty in the matter, and affirmed that he had always been very strict and often very hard in his interpretation of the law regarding aliens.

The most important change made in the Bill on the Report stage was the insertion of a provision that subject to certain exceptions, no certificate of naturalisation should be granted to any subject of an enemy country for five years after the end of the war.

During its progress through the Upper House the Bill was made still more stringent. Thus, as passed by the House of Commons the Bill left the Home Secretary some discretion in the matter of cancelling naturalisation certificates obtained by fraud; but an amendment in the House of Lords made it obligatory upon him. This amendment was carried against the Government. But the Government maintained their position in opposing another amendment which provided that no naturalised person of enemy alien origin should be registered as a Parliamentary elector for ten years after the grant of the certificate. The Lord Chancellor urged the House to reject the amendment, on the ground that if a person were not fit to vote he ought not to be naturalised, and the House followed his advice. On a subsequent occasion likewise (July 26) when the Lords severely criticised the Bill as not being nearly strong enough to meet the public demand, the Lord Chancellor again urged moderation on the House. He described the suggestion of a hidden hand as a mere delusion, and asked the House not to lose its head and rush into extreme measures which would make it ridiculous. The Bill eventually became law on August 8.

Another Bill which received the royal sanction on the same date, the Trading with the Enemy (Amendment) Bill, had for its object the exclusion of any enemy banks from carrying on business in this country for a period of years after the war. On the day on which this measure was read a first time in the House of Commons (July 19) the Senior Official Receiver announced that by an order of the Board of Trade he had been appointed Controller to wind up the businesses of the enemy banks in the United Kingdom.

Meanwhile the Aliens Advisory Committee, first appointed on May 24, 1915, to advise the Home Office on applications by enemy aliens for exemption from internment was considerably strengthened, and commenced a wholesale and stringent review of all cases of enemy aliens who were still at liberty. The Committee as reconstituted consisted of Mr. Justice Sankey, G.B.E., Mr. Justice Younger, G.B.E., Sir John Butcher, Bt., K.C., M.P., Lord Lambourne, C.V.O., Sir Donald Maclean,

K.B.E., M.P., Mr. John J. Mooney, M.P., Major-General Lord Cheylesmore, K.C.V.O., and Mr. Thomas Richards, M.P. At its first meeting on July 21, the policy of the Committee was enunciated by Mr. Justice Sankey, who stated that some 25,000 individual cases were expected to come up for reconsideration. The Committee would act on the cardinal principle of giving the State the benefit of the doubt. At the same time justice would be done to each case, the special circumstances of which would be taken into consideration. Finally, Mr. Justice Sankey announced that the Committee would sit in private.

Yet despite all this activity, there was much agitation outside the walls of Parliament in favour of still greater stringency. Demonstrations were held demanding that all enemy aliens without exception should be interned. The Royal Society adopted a motion in favour of expelling all enemy aliens from its membership. Members of the House of Commons decided to form an Aliens Watch Committee, with Sir Edward Carson as Chairman and Sir Henry Dalziel as Vice-Chairman, for the purpose of following the action of the Government in connexion with enemy aliens. So great did the misuse of the word alien become that a French resident in London was moved to write to *The Times* (July 22) protesting against the application of the term to his people, whether in official documents or in conversation.

Though the Aliens question made a great noise in Parliament, the main legislative proposal of the Session was the Education Bill. During July it passed through all its stages in both Houses, the only controversial point being the clause which provided for the abolition of fees in public elementary schools. In the Commons Mr. Fisher warmly defended the proposal, pointing out that the Bill retained fees in secondary schools, abolished them in elementary schools, and provided for free education in continuation schools. In other words, it applied the principle that where education was compulsory it was to be given without charge to the parents, but where the parent had an option whether or not he sent his child to a particular type of school, there he should be at liberty to pay fees. A hostile amendment was defeated by 157 votes to 51, and the clause was agreed to. The Bill was one of the group that received royal assent on August 8.

Next in importance to the Education Bill was the new Vote of Credit for which Mr. Bonar Law asked the House of Commons on August 1, to tide the Government over the two months' recess. The amount was 700,000,000*l.*, the largest sum ever asked at a single sitting by any statesman in our financial history. The new vote, the third this year, brought the total amount granted in this way during the financial year which began on April 1 to 1,800,000,000*l.*, and to 8,042,000,000*l.* since the beginning of the war. In introducing the vote, Mr. Bonar Law for the first time gave particulars of the indebtedness of

our Allies. The total of 1,402,000,000*l.* was made up as follows: Russia, 568,000,000*l.*; France, 402,000,000*l.*; Italy, 313,000,000*l.*; the smaller states of the Alliance, including Belgium, Serbia, Rumania, and Greece, 119,000,000*l.* The debt due from the Dominions was 208,500,000*l.*

Mr. Bonar Law gave an analysis of the national expenditure from the beginning of the financial year to July 13—104 days in all. The expenditure was 2,500,000*l.* below the estimate. There had been a considerable diminution in dead-weight expenditure, and the increase had been entirely in recoverable expenditure. The figures for the four fighting forces showed an under-spending to the extent of 21,500,000*l.* Mr. Bonar Law explained that a reduction of 4,000,000*l.* on the Air Service did not mean that there had been any falling-off in the estimated production of material. On the other hand, 10,000,000*l.* of an Admiralty reduction of a little more than 18,000,000*l.* referred to merchant shipbuilding. He admitted that this was a cause of anxiety, and the position was not satisfactory so long as British shipping was being sunk more rapidly than it was being built. He gave an assurance that the Cabinet were taking the position again into consideration in the most complete way. The Army showed an entirely satisfactory increase of 8,000,000*l.*, as it was due to the fact that the ration strength was greater than had been estimated.

Mr. McKenna followed the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and referring to the subject of the advances to our Allies reminded the House that there was another side of the picture, and that was the advances made to us. He feared that the time was not very remote when, whilst we were a creditor on the one side, we should be an equally great debtor on the other. At the same time he felt very strongly the immense debt of gratitude we owed to the United States.

Four days later (August 5) the general financial situation of the country was the subject of a debate in the House of Lords. In introducing the topic Lord Inchcape urged the Peers to look ahead and face the aftermath of our enormous war borrowing. He pointed out that if the war ended in March, 1919, we should be left with a National Debt of probably 6,000,000,000*l.* Interest on that, with a Sinking Fund, would require something like 330,000,000*l.* a year. Accordingly it would not be safe to assume that our annual expenditure would be for a long time less than 700,000,000*l.*—more than three times what it was before the war. He estimated that the last budget might just pull us through, although it would be a narrow squeak. Looking at our gigantic liabilities abroad, Lord Inchcape declared that our position in the matter of foreign exchanges would for a time be serious. He reminded the House that we had in circulation 260,000,000*l.* of currency notes, against which there was only a very small percentage of gold. It would take years, he said, to redeem those notes, and to get back to the mainstay of our

old international financial position—a real gold standard. He feared that we were living for the moment in a fool's paradise, so far as the popular notion of prosperity was concerned. There might be a short boom in trade after peace had been restored, but it was difficult to see how there could be any lasting international prosperity for many years to come.

Lord Inchcape laid down the following conditions as vital for the re-establishment of a sound financial position after the war :—

(1) We must provide and maintain an adequate Sinking Fund for the debt we have incurred. (2) We must honourably meet our obligations as they fall due. (3) We must get rid as soon as possible of the inflated paper currency, and to do this we must spend less than our income. (4) We must produce more and export more, and we must consume less. (5) To accomplish all this, it will be necessary to go through a prolonged period of self-denial and strenuous work.

Lord Faringdon, who followed, conceded that the position which Lord Inchcape had disclosed was an appalling one, yet he refused to consider the possibility of a budget of 700,000,000*l.* He thought it would be possible before long to fund the debt on a 4 per cent. basis, and, with a Sinking Fund of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to dispose of the whole debt in about fifty-six years. That would mean an annual expenditure of 270,000,000*l.*, and he estimated that the probable total expenditure after the war would be 510,000,000*l.*

Lord Emmott, on the other hand, considered Lord Faringdon's views a little too optimistic, and argued that prices would remain high for a long time.

Lord Curzon replied for the Government in a speech which did little more than sum up the chief considerations which had emerged from the debate.

The question of British shipping, to which Mr. Bonar Law referred in his Vote of Credit speech, was the subject of two debates in the House of Commons. On July 10 the adjournment of the House of Commons was moved on a plea of urgency to enable a debate to take place on recent developments of the national shipyard scheme. Mr. France, in introducing the subject, declared that no ships had yet appeared from the national yards, and none were likely to appear for some time. The thing had become, in his opinion, a speculative adventure. His information was that there were a number of highly-paid foremen walking about these yards with nothing to do, and he asked for an interim injunction, so that the Government could not proceed further, until the House of Commons had expressed their opinion on the matter.

Sir Hamar Greenwood, in seconding the motion, declared that the only way in which men or managers could be got for the national yards was by seducing them by higher wages from the private yards—"a mean and shabby trick." Shipbuilding,

he insisted, was not a trade which could be shifted from the rivers of the North, where it was indigenous, to any old spot in the western part of England. As millions of money had been wasted, he appealed to the Government to give up the pursuit of a phantom conception.

A defender of the national yards appeared in Sir J. Norton Griffiths. He had visited one of them, and, in his opinion, it was ideally situated for shipbuilding.

Sir Eric Geddes made a full reply for the Admiralty. He declined to make excuses for the national yards, and offered instead an explanation and a justification. After explaining in detail why the original plan of building the fabricated ships in these yards with prisoners of war and military labour had been abandoned in favour of civilian labour, he made it plain that Lord Pirrie, the War Cabinet, and he backed the scheme in every way and the whole of it. In his opinion and in that of his advisers, the national yards would be a great asset. He gave an assurance that they were being constructed in a thoroughly practical way. Lord Pirrie, he explained, had brought to the Severn the managing director of his Belfast yard and a very large number of the drawing staff and technical heads. The Government, he declared, believed that the national yards would be a success, and the Controller-General and he meant to see the scheme through.

Three weeks later (July 30) Sir Eric Geddes had once more to defend the Government's shipbuilding policy. He informed the House that for the first half of this year the Allies had not gone back at all on account of the enemy's depredations on mercantile shipping. That result had been obtained by reduced sinkings and increased building. The position, he explained, was again changing. The enemy had found it too dangerous to work in-shore and was going farther out again. Accordingly, the number of ships damaged as well as the number sunk was going down, and a transference of men from repairs to new construction was possible in the near future.

Sir Eric Geddes reminded members that up to now this country had borne the burden to a preponderating extent of fighting the submarine. But the American programme was now beginning to come along, and he had within the last few days considered it in detail with Mr. Roosevelt, the Assistant Secretary of the United States Navy Department. He was able to say that that conference had confirmed what he had throughout relied upon, that, when once the flow of destroyers and anti-submarine craft had fairly started from the United States, it would become a formidable torrent. He looked forward to the day in the not very distant future when the Admiralty would feel the relief of that torrent, and would be able to divert some portion of the country's resources from meeting the heavy demand for warships and auxiliary craft to the replacement of its mercantile marine losses.

The First Lord assured the House that the national yards could be provided with both labour and material, and that they would produce ships in the shortest possible time. He announced that the first keel would be laid in a month's time and one every three weeks after that. The ultimate maximum capacity of the national yards was three ships a berth a year, or roughly 100 ships for the 34 berths. The establishment would be 300 men a berth, or 10,000 altogether. After quoting Lord Pirrie in support of the view that the scheme was as wise and prudent an undertaking to-day as it was a year ago, Sir Eric Geddes declared that the Government had every intention of pursuing it.

This speech came in for a good deal of criticism. Mr. George Lambert, from the Front Opposition Bench, held that the true policy of the Government was to have strengthened and supplemented private enterprise. Mr. Alexander Richardson, in an effective maiden speech, contended that, whereas the cost of a berth in a national yard was 120,000*l.*, one could be put down in a private yard for less than 30,000*l.* Lieutenant-Commander Norman Craig, on the other hand, insisted that the Admiralty would have laid themselves open to a charge of criminal neglect if they had not taken action in regard to national yards in June, 1917. Mr. Runciman, in a comparison between national and private yards, told the House that on the Tees, under the energetic guidance of one of our younger shipbuilders, a yard which was started last March would in a week or two be turning out fabricated ships. Almost thrice the time, he declared, had been spent on the national yards as on this magnificent yard on the Tees.

The general feeling was that the shipbuilding position, in view of the activities of enemy submarines, was grave, and Dr. Macnamara's reply to Colonel Godfrey Collins on British tonnage output was not calculated to reassure public opinion. The Parliamentary Secretary of the Admiralty stated that while the estimates of tonnage for the first and second quarter respectively of 1918 was 425,000 and 445,000 gross tons, the actual output was 320,280 and 442,966 gross tons respectively.

Another question on which there appeared to be strong feeling in both Houses was that of the agreement with Germany for the exchange of prisoners of war. Both Lord Newton and Sir George Cave had proceeded to The Hague in order to arrive at some arrangement with representatives of the German Government. On their return Lord Newton in the Lords and the Home Secretary in the Commons stated that a far-reaching agreement for exchanging prisoners had been concluded, but that its execution was dependent on the ratifications of the two Governments. Incidentally Lord Newton declared that the negotiations were in no degree facilitated by the active campaign simultaneously waged in this country against enemy aliens. Both speakers warned their audiences not to expect too much from the agreement,

Amid the excitement engendered by the aliens agitation the question of extending the life of the existing Parliament was not overlooked. The last extension had been for eight months, until July 30. On this, the fifth occasion of the extension, the period was for six months, until January 30, 1919, thus making the life of Parliament exactly eight years, or three more than it allotted to itself by the Parliament Act. In asking the House to agree to the Bill (on July 8) Mr. Bonar Law said that the Government had never considered, and were unlikely to consider, whether or not an election might be desirable. That, he insisted, must depend on circumstances beyond their control. Mr. Asquith thought the course the Government had taken was absolutely necessary. The extension, he imagined, must be "very nearly the last." He claimed that the answer to those who said that Parliament had exceeded its mandate and was no longer in contact with the electorate was the exigencies of the war.

In the debate a good deal was heard of the preparation of the new Register. Mr. Gilbert told the Government that the manner in which it had been prepared had given rise to a great deal of dissatisfaction, especially in London. Mr. Hayes Fisher, speaking for the Local Government Board, was quite ready to give an assurance that the Register would be operative by January 1, 1919. He could even give the assurance, if it was sought, for three months earlier.

Mr. Ponsonby spoke of the House of Commons as stale, tired, and, to a certain extent, stunned by the events of the last four years. He expressed the hope that the Government would expedite an appeal to the country.

Mr. Bonar Law replied that the necessity of such an appeal must depend upon the circumstances at any given time. He suggested that the disadvantages of the political disturbance of an election must be weighed with the disadvantages of a House of Commons that did not represent the feeling of the country. He was certain that, if the circumstances seemed to indicate that there was any doubt about the Government representing the people in the policy they were carrying out, it must be set at rest by an appeal to the country.

The Bill also provided that no municipal elections should be held in November.

The result of the East Finsbury Election which was published on July 17 hardly pointed to any loss of prestige on the part of the Government. Mr. H. E. A. Cotton, the Government candidate, polled 1156 votes as compared with 576 and 199 respectively polled by each of the Independent candidates. All the candidates were considerably handicapped by the petrol restrictions, which reduced the use of motor-cars very much. The dearth of paper also restricted the placarding of the constituency and the distribution of bills and pamphlets. The Government candidate was perhaps the most modest in this

respect. He confined himself to the issuing of hand-bills emphasising his attitude regarding the internment of enemy aliens, in which he showed that he was in full accord with the proposals of the Government on the report of Sir Henry Dalziel's Committee.

About the same time as this election result was issued there was a slight rearrangement of the Ministry (July 19). In view of the increasing burden of work which the necessities of the war imposed upon the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, he expressed a wish that Lord Robert Cecil should take a larger and more responsible part in the work of the Foreign Office, and this necessitated the latter's resignation from the post of Minister of Blockade. Lord Robert was appointed Assistant Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, being succeeded as Minister of Blockade by Sir L. Worthington Evans, Bt., M.P., the Parliamentary Under Secretary to the Minister of Munitions. This post was given to Major-General the Rt. Hon. J. E. B. Seeley, M.P., who continued to act as Deputy Minister of Munitions and to discharge his special duties as member of Council for the Warfare Group of the Ministry of Munitions. Another appointment was that of Major the Hon. Waldorf Astor, M.P., who became Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food, in succession to the Rt. Hon. J. R. Clynes, M.P., promoted Food Controller on the death of Lord Rhondda.

No sooner had these new ministerial appointments been announced than the country received the first intelligence of labour disaffection which threatened to develop into a strike. On Saturday, July 20, the Ministry of Munitions announced that a labour dispute had begun at Coventry and other centres. A large number of skilled munition workers had handed in notices to take effect early in the following week. If the strike actually occurred, the official intimation continued, it would lead to a stoppage of some of the most vital and urgently needed appliances and munitions of war. "It is therefore necessary," the communique continued, "that the public should understand in good time what the trouble is. Owing to the scarcity of skilled labour in the country created by the needs of the Army and the grave emergency of the war, it became necessary some time ago to make sure that the skilled labour available was fairly shared among munition firms, and in some cases to place a limit on the number of skilled workers which particular employers and firms were entitled to engage. If this had not been done, employers, instead of making reasonable efforts to economise skilled labour, so that what we have might be used to the best public advantage, would have been led to strive against each other for skilled men regardless of the national interest. One firm would have been overcrowded with skilled men; another, doing equally important work, would have been stopped for want of them. The Ministry of Munitions, after a full explanation had been given to the responsible Trade Union leaders, issued instructions

under its legal powers limiting for the present the right of employers in about 100 firms to add to the number of men on their staffs."

The Executive of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers were anxious to avoid any stoppage of work and urged all their members to remain at work. The shop stewards, on the other hand, objected to the Government action, and in opposition to the advice of the Trade Union leaders advocated a strike. A Government notice posted in the disaffected areas attempted to convince the men of the honesty of purpose of the Government's policy. "The State's only object is to use the skilled labour of the country so as to give the greatest help to our armies at the front."

By the 23rd the strikers decided to suspend their strike notices pending a national conference of the joint allied trades. Nevertheless on the following day 12,000 skilled workers at Coventry ceased work. It appeared that this action was taken in face of the executives of the men's unions and of their own constituted local authority. They defied the Government, after the clearest warnings as to the consequences of their action. The men held to the view that the embargo violated the liberty of the worker in the free disposal of his labour, and their temper was described as resolute. Trouble was also brewing in Birmingham, Manchester, and Lincoln. The War Cabinet held the view that the strike was not an ordinary dispute between employers and employed but that it was action directed against the State. That drastic measures would be taken was only the corollary of such a standpoint, and drastic measures were taken. On July 26 the strike spread to Leeds where 300,000 munition workers threatened to cease work on the following Tuesday if the embargo were not suspended. Over 100,000 workers were reported to be out in Birmingham. Never since the war began was any strike so universally condemned throughout the country. It was not surprising therefore that on July 27 the Prime Minister caused the following announcement to be made on behalf of the Government:—

"Certain men in the munitions workshops have ceased work in disregard to their duly accredited leaders, and have remained idle against the advice of the Trade Union Advisory Committee. They have ceased work, not in pursuance of a trade dispute, but in an endeavour to force the Government to change the national policy essential to the prosecution of the war. Whilst millions of their fellow-countrymen are hourly facing danger and death for their country, the men now on strike have been granted exemption from these perils only because their services were considered of more value to the State in the workshops than in the Army.

"It is now necessary for the Government to declare that all men wilfully absent from their work on or after Monday, July 29, will be deemed to have voluntarily placed themselves

outside the area of munitions industries. Their protection certificates will cease to have effect from that date, and they will become liable to the provisions of the Military Service Acts."

This manifesto had the desired effect. Reason prevailed, and the strike died down. On July 30 the Minister of Munitions announced that as work had been generally resumed in Birmingham and Coventry, he proposed immediately to appoint the Committee of Inquiry.

Even before this thorny problem had been solved, another was already threatening the Government. On July 29 Mr. Dillon introduced a motion into the House of Commons, declaring that the Irish policy of the Government was inconsistent with the principles for which the Allies were carrying on the war. The Irish Nationalist members returned to the House on July 23 after an absence of three months, and Mr. Dillon's motion was their first demonstration. Mr. Dillon described Ireland as lying under the unfettered tyranny of a military Government. He charged the Government with having done everything in their power to drive Ireland out of the war. He suggested that, if no British statesman was strong enough for the task, President Wilson should be called in to settle the Irish question. He would be content to submit the fortunes of his country to a jury of Americans appointed by the President. He asked that any step of the kind should be accompanied by the abandonment of the outrageous coercion system now in force.

In his reply the Chief Secretary told the Nationalists that they were the people who were really to blame in Ireland. What help, he asked, had the Government had from them in their efforts to avoid conscription by setting up a system of voluntary recruiting? "None at all," he declared. "Instead of taking Sinn Féin by the throat they have tried to go one better." Mr. Shortt declared that the position in Ireland was vastly improved. Illegal drilling had practically disappeared. Seditious speaking had largely disappeared. There were still hidden printing-presses which turned out highly seditious pamphlets, but they were being stamped out as thoroughly as possible. Ireland, he added, was exceedingly prosperous, and he hoped that something would be done to make her contented. But he warned Irishmen that if they would do things which made a step in that direction impossible, they had only themselves to blame.

Sir George Reid moved an amendment to Mr. Dillon's motion deploring the organised attempts made in many parts of Ireland to prevent Irishmen from joining their fellow-citizens in Great Britain in defence of the liberties of free nations. He insisted that, just as the American Union fought to the death to preserve its integrity, so the whole Empire would fight to the death to preserve the integrity of the United Kingdom.

Sir Mark Sykes, after some criticism of Sir Edward Carson

and the Ulster movement, declared that to have Ireland garrisoned and controlled during the Peace Conference would be thrown in our teeth and in the teeth of the Allies.

Mr. Asquith expressed his reluctance to submit the Irish question to the arbitrament of a foreign Power, however friendly and closely allied. "How are you going to have a League of Nations?" Mr. Dillon asked. Mr. Asquith replied that there were many difficulties in the way. "Ireland will be one of the greatest," Mr. Dillon retorted. Mr. Asquith agreed, and urged that we must make one more effort to settle the question for ourselves.

Mr. Bonar Law, in winding up for the Government, said that he had never listened to an Irish debate which seemed so unreal. He urged that it was impossible at this moment to put any form of Home Rule Government into force in Ireland. Speaking with great feeling, he asked whether the Irish members, in the gravest crisis in the world's history, were going to take the line that, because they were not pleased with what the Government were doing, they would be against us in this struggle.

The division showed a majority of 139 for the Government (245 to 106).

Before the recess both Houses discussed the Montagu-Chelmsford Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms. The scheme was so heartily welcomed in the Commons that Mr. Montagu was able to claim at the end of the debate as "a remarkable fact" the acceptance by all speakers of the principle of self-government for India. The Lords were inclined to be more critical, but their verdict was on the whole a favourable one. Optimism also characterised the proceedings of the Imperial War Conference, at the sittings of which post-war economic policies occupied the chief place. The official summary of the proceedings of this assembly refers specifically to three important resolutions. "The first subject on which a resolution was passed dealt with the recent Non-ferrous Metal Industry Act of the United Kingdom, and the question of similar legislation in the oversea Dominions. This resolution was to the effect that, in pursuance of the policy of freeing the Empire from dependence on German controlled organisations in respect of non-ferrous metals and ores, the Conference endorsed the principle of the Non-Ferrous Metal Industry Act of the United Kingdom, and recommended that the Governments of the Empire should adopt effective measures, in so far as these might be necessary and not already taken, to carry out this policy.

"The next resolution related to the measures necessary to secure for the British Empire and the belligerent Allies the command of certain essential raw materials to enable them to repair the effects of war as soon as possible and safeguard their industrial requirements. The Conference agreed that this course

was necessary, and expressed the opinion that the Governments of the British Empire should make such arrangements among themselves as would ensure that the essential raw materials produced within the Empire should be available for the purposes named above, and should arrange with the Allied countries to utilise for the same purposes the essential raw materials produced in those countries.

"A further resolution in connexion with the same question recommended that a Committee of members of the Conference should first consider the possible methods by which each part of the Empire could obtain command of the essential raw materials referred to in the previous resolution, and that the Governments represented at the Conference should, in the light of the information collected by their representatives on this Committee, consult with representatives of the producers and trades concerned as to the method of obtaining command best suited to each individual commodity."

The Conference held its sixteenth and last meeting on July 26, and on the following day the members were received by the King at Buckingham Palace. In his reply to their address, the King said that he looked forward to the day, after the restoration of peace, when the Prince of Wales would be able to visit different parts of the Dominions beyond the seas.

The note struck at the Conference that the Empire must control its raw materials, was reiterated by the Prime Minister in his speech on July 31 to a deputation of about 200 heads of manufacturing firms, convened at the instance of the National Union of Manufacturers. Mr. Lloyd George told his audience that under no conditions must industries which are essential from the point of view of national defence and security be let down in the future. The present system of rigid, meticulous interference by the Government with trade will not be continued after the war, but control must remain to a certain extent until we get over the transition period. Nor must the mistake be made of dissolving partnership with our Dominions and our Allies the moment the fighting is over. We must keep the partnership going and help each other to the end so that the brotherhood shall remain. Mr. Bonar Law who followed the Prime Minister laid stress on the same points. The country, he declared, had taken a step which was an immense move forward in our whole conception of trade policy—namely, the acknowledgment that, so far as this Government was concerned, the principles that we were one Empire and of Preference within that Empire were established. We must ourselves produce the things that are essential to preserving the safety and independence of the country. Preference will be of immense advantage to the whole Empire if the same readiness which the Dominions had shown during the war to place their produce at the disposal of the Empire were continued after the war, and it was essential that it should continue.

This declaration on the trade policy of the country Mr. Lloyd George made before a private gathering. But before the Parliamentary recess he surveyed the military situation and the achievements of the country before the assembled Commons. On August 7 the Prime Minister came down to the House and gave an encouraging review of the present, and held out a hopeful prospect for the future. The House was rather tired and the attendance was by no means full. The principal points of the speech may be summarised as follows:—

The Navy's Part.—At least 150 submarines had been destroyed—half during the past year. The tonnage of the Navy had increased from 2,500,000 at the beginning of the war to 8,000,000, including the auxiliary fleet. At least 1,500,000 men were required to man and maintain the Navy and the mercantile marine, probably 800,000 or 900,000 of military age.

Our Man-Power Effort.—Since August, 1914, Great Britain had raised for the Army and Navy 6,250,000 men, including those already with the Colours. The Dominions had contributed 1,000,000 men. India had raised 1,250,000 men.

The Military Situation.—There had been four and a half months of such fighting as has never been seen on the face of the globe. Before the battle of March 21 was over, in a fortnight's time, 268,000 men were thrown across the Channel. In a month's time 355,000 men had crossed. There had not been since March 21 an offensive conducted by forces of the same magnitude. The danger was not over, but he would be a sanguine man on the German General Staff who would now predict that General Ludendorff's plan of campaign would succeed and enable Germany to obtain a military decision this year.

The Coming of the Americans.—In order to carry the American troops, we had to sustain a loss of 200,000 tons a month of essential cargoes, which means 2,500,000 a year. In July 305,000 American troops were brought over, and 188,000 were carried in British ships. There would be no break in the increase of the American Army until it is not far short, if at all, of the German Army itself.

Needless to add the American soldiers in England enjoyed great popularity. No less sincere was English feeling for France, and France's Day was celebrated throughout the Empire, on July 12, with a heartiness and enthusiasm which the French themselves appreciated. Collections were made everywhere for the French Red Cross. The British Red Cross Committee made a gift of 75,000*l.* from its funds for a permanent tuberculosis farm colony for French soldiers. A memorial service was held in Westminster Cathedral, attended by representatives of all aspects of English life, at which the band of the First Regiment of Zouaves played. This band received popular ovations wherever it appeared; it played at the Mansion House, at the Baltic, and in Trafalgar Square.

The tendency to banking fusions, to which reference has already been made (see p. [55]), received yet another impetus during July when three more amalgamations were announced: (1) Barclay's Bank absorbed the London Provincial and South-Western Bank (itself an amalgamation dating only from the previous December); (2) sanction was given to the fusing of the London Joint Stock Bank with the London City and Midland Bank; and (3) the amalgamation of Lloyds Bank with the Capital and Counties Bank.

Meanwhile the State control of rationing was carried a step further, and on July 14 national ration books were introduced in place of the loose cards in vogue before. The new scheme co-ordinated and simplified the national and local measures of rationing already in operation, and prepared the way for any necessary development. It also enabled the Minister of Food to put into operation arrangements intended to secure the smoother working of the rationing machinery, and to make provision for supplementing or varying the rations in cases where the existing system applied unfairly.

The revised plans of the Food Controller may be summarised as follows:—

After July 14 there was to be national rationing of sugar, butter, margarine, lard, butcher's meat, and bacon. Tea was not rationed nationally, but local authorities were given authority to enforce their own schemes, and also ration in their areas cheese or other articles. Provision was made for the rationing of jam if this should become necessary, owing to the partial failure of the fruit crop. An interchange of rations as between meat and fats was allowed to vegetarians and Jews. The granting of supplementary rations of meat and fats to invalids was decentralised, and the extra ration might be allowed in respect of illnesses other than tuberculosis and diabetes. During the week ending July 6 special facilities for transferring registrations with retailers for rationed goods was given where good cause for transfer could be shown. Simplified methods of using ration coupons during temporary absences from home were devised. Soldiers and sailors on leave were provided with ration books for the period of the leave.

For general purposes the national ration books were of five kinds:—

1. White cover, adult's book.
2. Green cover, child's book.
3. Pink cover, supplementary book for boys between thirteen and eighteen.
4. Blue cover, supplementary book for manual workers graded F, E, or D.
5. Red cover, traveller's book.

The adult's book, of which 40,000,000 were printed, included coupons for sugar, butter, or margarine, lard, butcher's meat, and bacon. On the inside of the cover, and by the provision of

a spare leaf, space was made available for national or local rationing of any other articles the consumption of which needed to be regulated. Each book contained seven sheets of coupons. Sheet 1, coloured yellow, was to be used for sugar; sheet 2, coloured blue, was intended for butter and margarine; four sheets of red coupons were for meat rations, and finally there was a fawn-coloured sheet inserted in the book as a spare leaf, which might be used for lard. It was necessary to cut the coupons to detach them.

The eighth page of the book was white, and on its two sides contained numerous tiny spaces and a spare counterfoil. It was introduced to enable local authorities to apply rationing to additional articles. The ninth leaf of the book was coloured green, and was a reference leaf. It contained the holder's name and address, and the name of the issuing food office, and the holder had to sign it and copy the serial number of the book from the front cover. The lower part of the leaf was a form of declaration for use when the book required renewal and was intended to avoid the necessity of sending out application forms when the time for renewal came round.

The child's ration book was similar to that of an adult, except that only two meat coupons were provided for each week, and the coupons for other foods had the word "child's" printed on them. The pink supplementary ration book contained one sheet of sixteen meat coupons for use by adolescent boys. Arrangements were made for boys of eighteen who did not immediately enter the Army to continue to receive the supplementary ration while they remained in civil life. The blue supplementary ration book contained two sheets of additional meat coupons for use by industrial workers. The coupons in traveller's books were available for use at any retailer's who could supply the rations to the holder.

Two other matters relating to supplies deserve to be noted. One is the establishment of additional State restaurants, four in London, and one each in Leeds, Glasgow, Manchester, Newcastle, Brighton, Cardiff, Birmingham, and Bristol. The success of the restaurant in New Bridge Street in London was so great that the Director of National Kitchens at the Ministry of Food felt encouraged to extend the scheme. The other was the enforcement of more economy by the reducing by 25 per cent. of the consumption of coal and gas, as from July 1. The new Order was freely criticised in the House of Commons, the most insistent complaint being that it was not easily intelligible to the householder, who was most affected by it. Sir Albert Stanley, in a detailed defence of the action of the Coal Controller, admitted that those affected by the Order would have nothing like the same degree of comfort they enjoyed before the war. He contended, however, that the Order was rendered imperative by the war necessities of the Allies.

On August 8 both Houses adjourned until October 15. The

Session, which had opened on February 12, had been one of the busiest on record, no fewer than forty Government Bills, several of them of the first importance, having been placed on the statute book. Yet the year's supply had not received statutory sanction in an Appropriation Act.

Parliament did not separate without noticing the fourth anniversary of the war on August 4. The Prime Minister himself moved a resolution on July 17, requesting the Commons to attend at St. Margaret's, Westminster, on Sunday, August 4, in order to invoke the Divine Blessing on the country's cause. The Commons were joined by the Lords, and the King and Queen were also in attendance. The service became a National Intercession, and on the same day, August 4, Mr. Lloyd George sent the following message to the Empire:—

“10 DOWNING STREET, S.W. 1.

“The message which I send to the people of the British Empire on the fourth anniversary of their entry into the war is ‘Hold Fast.’

“We are in this war for no selfish ends. We are in it to recover freedom for the nations which have been brutally attacked and despoiled, and to prove that no people, however powerful, can surrender itself to the lawless ambitions of militarism without meeting retribution, swift, certain, and disastrous, at the hands of the free nations of the world. To stop short of Victory for this cause would be to compromise the future of mankind.

“I say ‘Hold Fast,’ because our prospects of Victory have never been so bright as they are to-day. Six months ago the rulers of Germany deliberately rejected the just and reasonable settlement proposed by the Allies. Throwing aside the last mask of moderation, they partitioned Russia, enslaved Rumania, and attempted to seize supreme power by overwhelming the Allies in a final and desperate attack. Thanks to the invincible bravery of all the Allied armies, it is now evident to all that this dream of universal conquest, for the sake of which they wantonly prolonged the war, can never be fulfilled.

“But the battle is not yet won. The great autocracy of Prussia will still endeavour by violence or guile to avoid defeat and so give militarism a new lease of life. We cannot seek to escape the horrors of war for ourselves by laying them up for our children. Having set our hands to the task, we must see it through till a just and lasting settlement is achieved.

“In no other way can we ensure a world set free from war.

“**HOLD FAST!**

“D. LLOYD GEORGE.”

CHAPTER IV.

THE STRAIN AT ITS HEIGHT.

THE Prime Minister's appeal was opportune. Throughout August and September the country witnessed a series of successive strikes that told of dissatisfaction among the workers. The London Omnibus Conductresses, the Lancashire Cotton Operatives, the Welsh Railwaymen, even the London Policemen, all gave expression to their feeling of unrest by ceasing from their work. In many cases the strikes were declared by the men in the workshop against the advice and instructions of the official Trade Union leaders. The process was explained as being the result of the "shop stewards' movement," and was alleged in some quarters to be due to the rise of prices and to resentment at profiteering. But whatever the cause the movement was undoubtedly widespread.

It began on August 19 by a strike of tramway and omnibus workers in London to enforce the women's demand for a war bonus equal to 5s. awarded in July to the men by the Committee on Production. An important principle was thus involved, *viz.*, that women should receive equal pay with men for equal work. London had to do without its omnibuses, and the streets took on a quiet aspect. The underground railways had to cope with a concourse of people which expanded still more the already swollen stream of passengers produced by war conditions, and the tube services were very nearly involved in the stoppage above-ground. The example set by the tramway and omnibus workers produced a feeling of restiveness among the female staffs on the tube railways. On the Bakerloo Railway in particular, at the Elephant and Castle, and at some other stations, a number of the girls refused to work. A certain amount of delay in the running of the trains resulted, but otherwise the service was not seriously affected, as the National Union of Railwaymen advised the tube girls to remain at work. The strike soon spread to other centres, including Bath, Brighton and Hove, Bristol, Folkstone, Hastings, and Weston-super-Mare. Sir George Askwith, the Chief Industrial Commissioner, used his best efforts to arrange a settlement, but without success. The movement continued to grow, and on August 21 it was stated that between 17,000 and 18,000 men and women were on strike. Ultimately Sir George Askwith succeeded in settling the dispute, which came to an end on the evening of the 22nd, after a meeting of the strikers who accepted their leaders' advice to return to work pending the consideration by the Committee on Production of the question under dispute. On August 29 the Committee on Production decided that the women tramway and omnibus workers should receive the 5s. bonus which had been awarded to the men.

Before even this strike was settled, some 20,000 miners in

the Rotherham district ceased work. The dispute in this case concerned the interpretation of an award as to working hours. But this strike was of brief duration ; an agreement was arrived at very quickly in London at a conference to which the Coal Controller had invited representatives of the masters and the men.

Equally brief were the strikes of the women workers on the London tubes, of the ladies' tailors in East London, and of the London Police. But the Police strike, which lasted from Friday, August 30, to Saturday evening, August 31, was an exceptional occurrence. The National Union of Police and Prison Officers demanded an increased war bonus, the re-instatement of a constable who had been dismissed the force, and the official recognition of the union. The first demand was declared by the authorities to be under consideration, but on the other two no satisfactory reply was afforded. Accordingly, at midnight on Thursday numbers of the police on duty in Westminster and other central districts left their beats. On Friday the strike extended with dramatic suddenness. By midday, with very few exceptions, the entire Metropolitan Police Force, numbering something over 12,000 men, was on strike, and in the evening the strikers were joined by virtually all the men of the City Police Force.

General Smuts attempted to compose the dispute by negotiations with a deputation consisting of two representatives of each division. But the men insisted on his receiving the members of their executive or nobody at all. Early on Saturday the following announcement was issued : " The men have been told that, provided they return to duty, the Government will give full and sympathetic consideration to their representations." About 4 o'clock on Saturday afternoon some thousands of the strikers, who had discarded their uniform for mufti, marched from New Scotland Yard to Smith Square, Westminster, where they were joined by contingents from other parts of the Metropolitan Police area—an area of nearly 700 square miles, covering the whole district of Greater London within a radius of about 15 miles from Charing Cross. On their way from New Scotland Yard the procession crossed Old Palace Yard. Half a dozen officers of the special constabulary who were sitting in motor-cars in a corner of the yard were booed and jeered at as " scabs " and " blacklegs." An ordinary constable on duty near the Victoria Tower also came in for some abuse and much chaff, but he took it in good part. From Smith Square the strikers marched in column of fours to Tower Hill. The procession, which extended over at least half a mile, puzzled a good many of the bystanders. Anything like a general strike of police constables in London was unprecedented, and, until it was an actual fact, almost inconceivable. The strikers were evidently in the best of humour, for some of them sang and some of them cheered as they tramped along behind a solitary piper, presumably a

policeman with a musical hobby. The novelty of the situation reached its height when, at the Blackfriars end of Queen Victoria Street, a City constable who was still on duty held up the traffic for the procession. There was some good-humoured banter between the strikers and the City policemen on point duty at several of the City crossings. At Tower Hill the strikers were harangued for more than an hour by officials of their union and other speakers not connected with the police force. As the meeting proceeded the number of the audience was swelled every few minutes by the arrival of fresh parties from outlying districts. Each reinforcement was cheered, but the loudest cheer of all was given to a body of City policemen who came up as the meeting was nearly at an end.

Meanwhile traffic in the streets went on much as usual and had to manage itself as best it could. From Westminster to the city boundary at Temple Bar only five policemen were to be seen. Two of them were in the forecourt of Charing Cross railway station; they were railway police. The remaining three were at the crossing of Wellington Street and the Strand, where the traffic from Waterloo Bridge or from Aldwych cuts across the Strand-Fleet Street stream. They were a middle-aged constable of the regular force and an inspector and a sergeant of the special constabulary. The three men were subjected to a good deal of twitting by several strikers in plain clothes, who made particular fun of the efforts of the "specials" to imitate the pose and gesture of the accomplished traffic regulator. The two amateurs were obviously a little flustered by their unaccustomed task, but even a critic disposed to be hostile would not deny that they performed it efficiently. Oxford Circus, Piccadilly Circus, and the crossing of Tottenham Court Road and Oxford Street were left entirely to themselves. Even the police at Buckingham Palace were reported to have been affected by the strike and only a reduced number of the men remained at their post.

That same afternoon Mr. Lloyd George intervened, and as the result of conferences between him and the executive of the union, the London police strike was settled, and the men returned promptly to duty in the evening. The terms of the settlement were announced at a meeting on Tower Hill, attended by about 7,000 policemen, as follows:—

An increase of wages of 13s. per week, pensionable, and the war bonus of 12s. per week and the allowance for each child of 2s. 6d. a week would remain.

There was to be a non-contributory pension of 10s. per week for policemen's widows, the pension to be payable in the case of service men at the front.

The result was that the minimum wages pensionable were 2l. 3s. per week, which with the war bonus made a total of 2l. 15s. as the minimum, with the children's allowance in addition.

Before the strike the minimum wage began at 1l. 10s.

which with a war bonus of 12s. made a total of 2l. 2s., with the children's allowance of 2s. 6d. a week in addition. The men's claim was for 1l. per week increase of wages, pensionable, with a war bonus of 12½ per cent., so that the wages would have been 2l. 10s., *plus* 6s. 3d., minimum total 2l. 16s. 3d.

The novel feature of the Government's decision was the pension for widows, and it was received with enthusiasm by the men. The reinstatement of ex-Police-Constable Thiel, provincial organiser of the union and delegate to the London Trades Council, who was dismissed for taking part in the management of an "unauthorised association," was agreed to by the Government on the condition that the strikers started work on Saturday night. The other point in dispute was the recognition of the union. It was stated at the Tower Hill meeting that the Prime Minister gave the union recognition when he received the executive. Sir George Cave challenged this statement, and said:—

"The Prime Minister said he would receive the men as policemen. He could not receive them as the executive of a union, because that would be recognition. But he was quite prepared to receive them as representatives of the men, provided they were policemen themselves, which, of course, they were. Mr. Duncan was present to introduce them as a Member of Parliament."

One result of the strike was the resignation of Sir Edward Henry, the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis. He was succeeded by Lieut.-General Sir Cecil Frederick Macready.

Speaking in the House of Commons at a later date (October 25), Sir George Cave made a statement on the London Police strike, which he described as a very grave matter. He went so far as to declare that the police had forfeited public confidence for the time being. He was, however, persuaded, that the great majority of the men subsequently regretted their action, and he expressed his confidence that, if any attempt were made to induce them to repeat the strike, the result would be very different. Dealing with his own position as Home Secretary, Sir George Cave assured the House that he would gladly have retired with Sir Edward Henry, or in his stead, had the Prime Minister permitted him to do so.

The Home Office came in for severe criticism during the debate. Mr. Wiles, speaking as a London member, thought that the public would regard as weak and inefficient the Home Secretary's explanation of the culpable delay in dealing with the grievances of the police force.

Replying on the debate, Sir George Cave explained that the police had now been given the right to form a body consisting entirely of members of the force. They were also entitled to join any lawful body they thought fit, including the Police Union, on condition that there should be no interference with discipline and no endeavour to induce the men to leave their duty.

The success of the Police strike encouraged the London

Firemen to press claims which they had long urged. They demanded that their union, the Fire Brigade Branch of the National Union of Corporation Workers, should be recognised by the London County Council, and they threatened to take action unless this recognition was accorded. But there were other differences between the County Council and the men. The Brigade wanted their war bonus made permanent and pensionable as in the case of the London Police. Here, too, the services of Sir George Askwith were enlisted to secure a settlement of the dispute. A conference was held at the Ministry of Labour, and such was the progress made that a strike was for the moment averted.

Far more serious was the strike of Lancashire operative cotton spinners which broke out on September 16. As the finished product of the spinners was the war material of the weavers, becoming aeroplane fabric, military tents, kit bags, and other articles, the stoppage of the spinning mills threw very many workers out of employment and impeded the production of important war supplies. The dispute was in reality about wages. Since June, 1917, the cotton industry had been regulated by the Cotton Control Board, appointed by the Board of Trade, and consisting of an equal number of representatives of employers' associations and workpeople's organisations, together with a smaller number of representatives of other interests concerned. Sir Herbert Dixon was Chairman of the Board. One of the main functions of this body was to ration the diminished supplies of raw cotton coming into the country, and the rationing took the form of restrictions on the percentage of machinery to be kept running by the various mills, and on the number of hours each week for which it could be run. In order to reduce the hardship to the workpeople of the curtailment of work and consequently of earnings, a system was established by which the workers were unemployed by turns, and the Board paid to those who were "played off" an unemployment benefit from a fund contributed by the employers in proportion to the number of spindles they allowed to run.

Subsequently the Board abolished the rotation system of unemployment and substituted new proposals. After some negotiations, in which the President of the Board of Trade took a prominent part, these proposals were altered. The percentages of spindles to be run and the number of hours of the working week were extended. The scale of unemployment pay was also raised, but it was laid down that only workers continuously "played off" would be eligible for it. The officials of the Operative Spinners' Amalgamation accepted these concessions, but the members of the constituent associations rejected them on a ballot. The Control Board declined to give way further and threatened to resign if the Government forced their hands. The workers also refused to give way. There was therefore a complete deadlock, and of the 13,524 votes which were taken on the

question of the strike, 10,998 were in favour of the cessation of work and 2,526 against.

At first the position appeared to be threatening. The Prime Minister who was then on a visit to Manchester and who had been taken ill, was concerned at the turn of events, and, though confined to his bed, followed with unusual interest the negotiations that were taking place between the spinners and the Cotton Control Board. On September 16 he sent a letter to the General Secretary of the Amalgamated Association of Operative Cotton Spinners, appealing to the men "to return to work and leave the decision of the matters in dispute to the Government, after an inquiry by a tribunal to be at once appointed by the Government." The appeal was heeded; the men returned to work; and a tribunal of inquiry was appointed. The tribunal rejected the operatives' proposals to introduce the rota system of unemployment, but on the general question of wages they very strongly supported the men's demands. "The position of the cotton industry," the tribunal wrote, "is different from that of a considerable number of other industries during the war. Whilst it is admitted that the profits made are satisfactory and, indeed, high, and in that sense the industry may be said to be prosperous, that prosperity does not appear to be reflected in the earnings of operatives. We are told that the wages are about 60 per cent. above pre-war rates, but this is less than the advances granted in many trades and is reduced by short time to about 40 per cent. Relatively to the cost of living the operatives are considerably worse off than before the war and, by comparison with other trades, are bearing a disproportional share of burdens arising from the increased prices."

While the Cotton dispute was proceeding, trouble broke out in another quarter. The Railway men became restive, and demanded a further increase in wages. The war advance amounted by this time to 25s. per week, and the Railway Executive now offered a further advance of 4s. per week to all adult workers and 2s. to all under 18. That offer was rejected by both the National Union of Railwaymen and the Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen. As a result of further conversations the Committee increased their offer to 5s. and 2s. 6d. respectively. But the demand of the men was for 10s. per week advance for those over 18 and 5s. per week for those under 18. The breakdown of the negotiations (September 13) was reported to the Board of Trade, and Sir Albert Stanley notified the Unions that he was prepared to discuss the matter further with them. But the conference which was arranged was utterly fruitless, the men insisting on their original demand. So the dispute was taken to the War Cabinet which met the full Executive of the National Union of Railwaymen, and the 5s. and 2s. 6d. offer was accepted by the Executive on the understanding that there was to be immediately set up a committee composed of equal numbers of either side, whose duty it

would be to ascertain the exact increase in the cost of foodstuffs, the datum line being August 5, when the increase was 110 per cent. and the relationship to be 30s. The function of this committee, on agreeing as to the basis, was to arrange for such amount to be automatically applied without any new movement or application being made.

But the rank and file were disappointed that the original demands had not been obtained, and expressed their disaffection at numerous meetings all over the country. At Newport, in Monmouth, the men actually decided to come out on strike, and from there the strike movement quickly spread to London and elsewhere. The Government took the view that the strike was unjustified, seeing that the Union Executive had agreed to the Government proposals. Accordingly the Government declared that all necessary measures would be taken to maintain the train services in the affected areas for the requirements of the prosecution of the war. The naval and military authorities were called upon by the Government to assist the railways in continuing the services for the transport of munitions and supplies to the forces, for the working of ambulance trains, the transport of soldiers on leave, and the feeding of the civilian population.

The strike was condemned by all sections of the population, particularly in South Wales. At Newport a large military force was drafted into the town, ready for all emergencies. An interim injunction till the following Tuesday was, on Wednesday, September 25, granted on the application of the Board of Trade by Mr. Justice Salter, sitting in chambers, prohibiting the National Union of Railwaymen and the Amalgamated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen from paying strike pay to any of their members. This prompt action appeared to be effective, and on September 25 the railwaymen of South Wales decided to return to work at once and to recommend to all other strikers to do likewise. On the following day the trouble had blown over, but one result of the strike was the resignation of Mr. J. H. Thomas from the position of General Secretary of the National Union of Railwaymen, as a protest against the unconstitutional action of those who insisted on striking in face of the decision of the Executive Committee to accept the Government's terms.

Disloyalty of this kind led to another strike where likewise strong Government action became necessary. On September 18 a large number of shipwrights on the Clyde ceased work on the ground that the employers refused their demand for a minimum wage of 5*l.* per week. The Executive of the Trade Union concerned advised the men to return to work and declared their action unconstitutional. Nevertheless the strike movement spread, and on September 28 the Prime Minister directed an announcement to be made on behalf of the Government in which it was pointed out that the strikers had ceased from work

"in violation of the Munitions of War Acts, in breach of their agreements, and in defiance of the advice and instructions of their accredited leaders," and that therefore those men who did not return to work by Tuesday, October 1, would be called to the colours. Again the Government's action was effective, and the men returned to their work. As regards the men's claims for a minimum wage rate of 5*l.* per week, the Committee on Production pointed out that the men had already received 23*s.* 6*d.* per week war wage advance over pre-war rates, besides a bonus of 12½ per cent. on earnings, and that therefore the demands of the men could not be conceded.

In addition to these large-scale strikes there were a number of smaller strikes all over the country, as, for instance, of gas workers and other municipal employees in London, and of men engaged in coaling vessels at Liverpool. The problem of industrial unrest was considered as being of so serious a character that the National Alliance of Employers and Employed issued a manifesto calling for a thoroughly representative conference to consider a national policy for the prevention of strikes. At such a conference employers and employed should meet on terms of perfect equality. This proposal was also welcomed at the Trade Union Congress, the Jubilee Congress, which opened at Derby on September 2. The Congress accepted without discussion the following paragraph in the report:—

"In view of the many questions which will necessarily arise in connexion with the rapidly approaching readjustment period, your Committee desire to impress upon the officials and members of the unions the desirability of a frank acceptance of the principles embodied in the Whitley Report, and the setting up in each industry of Joint Industrial Councils, thereby averting future serious industrial disputes and the consequent trade dislocation."

The Derby Congress was attended by Mr. Samuel Gompers, at the head of an American Labour delegation. The Presidential Address was delivered by Mr. J. W. Ogden, Secretary of the Weavers' Association, who pleaded for loyal co-operation between the Congress, the industrial organisation of Labour, and the Labour Party, the political wing of the movement. He strongly deprecated proposals to form a purely trade union political party, on the ground that the Congress and the Labour Party were now so intertwined that whatever weakened the one would react on the other. He spoke with gratification of the tightening bonds between the trade union and the co-operative movements, and he touched on the thorny question of demarcation between unions. The solution he suggested was the establishment of one great national trade union, with separate officials and departments for the separate trades and crafts.

On the third day of the Congress there was a debate on peace, which concluded with a resolution comprising five demands:—

"1. It reaffirmed the declaration of the Blackpool Congress,

1917, that the holding of an International Labour and Socialist Conference was an essential preliminary to peace.

"2. It called on the Socialists of the Central Powers to state their war aims in response to the memorandum of Inter-Allied Labour.

"3. It demanded Labour representation at the Peace Conference of the Powers when the time came.

"4. It urged the Government to initiate peace negotiations immediately the enemy, either voluntarily or by compulsion, evacuated France and Belgium.

"5. It expressed belief in the principle of the Socialist international as the safest guarantee of the world's future peace."

The Congress also agreed to the principle of the 44 hour week; it decided to continue to co-operate with the Labour Party; it passed a resolution in favour of free trade; and once more voiced a demand for a comprehensive scheme of educational reform.

A second Labour Conference was held in England on September 17. This was the fourth Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference called since the beginning of the war, and sat at the Central Hall, Westminster. The Conference was summoned by the Parliamentary Committee of the Trade Union Congress and the National Executive of the Labour Party, in accordance with a suggestion from Mr. Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labour, in order that representatives of the American and European Labour movements might exchange views on war aims and peace negotiations with a number of Labour or Socialist organisations of Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, Serbia, America, and Greece; and the main result of the deliberations of the assembly was to adopt the fourteen points of Mr. Wilson as the war aims of Allied Labour.

If the strikes that broke out during September were one source of anxiety to the population of the country, the ravages of the influenza epidemic were another and far more serious one. The disease began to make itself felt in July, and during the first week of that month 218 deaths from influenza were officially reported by the Registrar-General for the whole country. The epidemic spread rapidly, and many schools had to be closed both because teachers and pupils alike fell victims to the scourge. By the end of October the weekly death roll in London alone rose to 761, while the total for 96 great towns was 1,895. Nurses were placed on the sick-list; the London Fire Brigade was depleted by many sufferers; and the telephone service in London was seriously affected by the absence of many operators. On October 27 as many as 1,400 members of the Metropolitan Police Force were incapacitated from duty by influenza. Reports from the country told the same tale. The Local Government Board issued detailed regulations giving advice both how to combat the scourge and how to avoid it. Yet by the end of October no improvement was visible. Nor were civilians only attacked. On

October 30 Dr. Macnamara told the House of Commons that there had been 120 deaths among men at the Crystal Palace during the last six months, 117 from pneumonia following influenza. The epidemic had affected over 1,000 men. Major Baird informed the House that 252 cases of influenza were reported at Blandford Camp, Dorset, in the week ended October 26. Of these 198 were sent to hospital. The number of deaths from this cause since September 21 had been 59. The scourge had even penetrated the walls of Belfast Prison. Mr. Arthur Samuels announced that 111 prisoners committed under Defence of the Realm Regulations and 14 officers of the prison were under medical treatment. During the first week of November, however, the epidemic appeared to be on the wane.

The attacks of the disease had to be borne at a time when a coal crisis threatened to become very serious. The output of coal decreased, and the demands of the Allies, particularly of Italy, rose. The result was that the people in this country had to make shift with a diminished supply. Efforts were made to release miners from the Army, and early in August some 8,000 ex-miners from the home forces were allowed to return to the mines. It was also suggested that female labour should be employed on the surface at collieries in order to release men for work underground. The Coal Controller appealed to the public to reduce their consumption, and to the miners to increase their output. On August 20 Sir Guy Calthrop informed the delegates to the Conference of the British Miners' Federation that the country was faced with an approximate coal deficiency of 36,000,000 tons a year. By means of the rationing of household coal, gas, and electricity throughout the country, he hoped to save from 8,000,000 to 9,000,000 tons upon last year's consumption, leaving a balance of 27,000,000 tons to be found. This deficit could only be met by a policy of rationing coal supplies to industries which, though not directly concerned with war work, were nevertheless important, and also by an improved output of coal. By the first week in September the coal situation was described as critical, and the Local Government Board issued a circular addressed to local authorities emphasising the vital need of a great national effort to meet the serious position which had arisen with regard to coal. The authorities were urged to set an example of economy by reducing the consumption of coal, gas, and electric light and power in public lighting and all undertakings and premises under their control to the minimum consistent with the necessary requirements of the public services; and, secondly, to take every opportunity of impressing on the public the paramount necessity of following this example.

The scarcity of fuel in the Teeside district had a serious effect on furnaces, there being no prospects of any increase in the output. Coal economies had to be introduced on the railways; the train services were cut down still more. There was a serious deficiency in the stocks of coal held by the railways. The supplies

in hand of the twelve leading railway companies on August 31 last amounted to 897,833 tons, which was only enough to carry on the traffic for $4\frac{1}{2}$ weeks. On the corresponding date of 1917 these companies had 1,776,370 tons on hand, representing more than $8\frac{1}{2}$ weeks' supply. In the House of Commons arrangements were made to reduce the consumption of light. It was even suggested that evening services in churches should be temporarily discontinued. The position threatened to become still more serious, and the Lord Mayor of London called a Conference of the London mayors, town clerks, and other officials at the Mansion House, on Friday, September 20, to discuss the coal situation. The object of the Conference was to consider what could be done by municipalities to save coal and the steps to be taken to impress on consumers the serious outlook for the coming winter and the urgent need for fuel economy. The Coal Controller issued a pamphlet in which hints were given as to how to save coal. The price of coal naturally went up. In addition to inconvenience, if not distress, caused by the dearth of household coal, the country was faced with the possibility of rationing industries. This might have meant that millions of workpeople would have been directly or indirectly affected by being obliged to work short time or to be out of employment. The situation was summed up in the figures issued by the Coal Controller which showed that during the first thirty-six weeks of 1918 (*i.e.*, until September 14), there was a net shortage of $15\frac{1}{2}$ million tons or about 8·8 per cent. when compared with the output during the corresponding period of 1917.

If the coal situation was bad, the food situation continued to be tolerable, although jam became dearer (September 2) and the meat ration was slightly reduced—as from September 22 a meat coupon was available for the purchase of 4*d.* worth of fresh meat instead of 5*d.* worth. But both bacon and ham remained unrationed. From official returns it appeared that there had been a considerable increase in the consumption of bread, so that the bread subsidy which was estimated to cost the country some 40,000,000*l.* per annum, threatened to rise to 60,000,000*l.* Rigid economy in this matter was urged on the public. The number of national kitchens all over the country grew by the end of August to 623, and plans for a further increase were contemplated. Within the Food Ministry itself efforts were made to co-ordinate the work by setting up a Food Council (September 24) to consider general questions of policy affecting the Administration of the Ministry, and at the same time to co-operate with other bodies engaged in dealing with the food problems of the Allies.

Despite the strikes, the influenza scourge, and the coal and food difficulties, the enemy aliens were not being neglected. The Aliens Advisory Committee, with Mr. Justice Sankey as president, which was appointed to inquire into the question of the internment and exemption from internment of enemy aliens,

recommended the internment of a large number of Germans. These included cases of aliens interned for the first time, as well as cases of aliens previously interned and subsequently released. The names of the interned were published weekly, and some 6,000 cases in all came up for consideration, exclusive of the cases in Scotland which were dealt with by a special Scottish Advisory Committee. On September 30 the Home Secretary also appointed a Committee, with Mr. Justice Atkin as chairman, for the purpose of considering cases where naturalisation should be revoked, in accordance with the terms of the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act, 1918. There was yet a third committee occupied in this field of activity ; it was presided over by Mr. Justice Bankes and its terms of reference were to inquire into the nationality of persons employed in Government offices and to report to the Prime Minister.

These, however, were small matters compared with the treatment of British prisoners in Germany. Even before October 15, when Parliament reassembled, feeling in the country on this question was already strong. The Inter-Departmental Prisoners of War Committee, presided over by Sir George Cave, met frequently during this period, and it was stated that Sir George was very keen to secure both the return of British prisoners from enemy countries where possible, and an improvement of the conditions in the internment camps for those whose repatriation was not secured. Meanwhile the German Government announced that they would not ratify the recent Anglo-German agreement for the exchange of prisoners unless guarantees were given against the deportation or internment of the Germans in China. This the British Government would not undertake to do, and as the treatment of British prisoners in Germany was becoming steadily worse, the German Government were warned that reprisals would be taken unless an improvement set in. This decision was made public on October 14, and on the following day in the Commons the condition of British prisoners in Germany formed a topic of great interest. In answer to many members, Sir George Cave informed the House that Germany had not yet sent a reply to the requirements recently addressed to her by this country. He explained further that the nature of the reprisals to be taken in the event of Germany's not complying with those requirements had not yet been agreed with our Allies. Arrangements, however, were being made for an early discussion, and a conclusion would be reached before the date when reprisals could be taken.

On the first day of the Session, when the business of the sitting had been disposed of, Mr. Pringle opened a debate on the sale of the *Daily Chronicle*, arguing that it was a Government speculation. As a matter of fact the *Daily Chronicle* was purchased by new proprietors, with Sir Henry Dalziel at their head, and Mr. Robert Donald, the editor and managing director, resigned in consequence. Sir Henry Dalziel took up Mr.

Pringle's challenge, and defended the purchase on business and journalistic grounds.

But the House quickly returned to the question of British prisoners in Germany. On October 18 the Government issued the text of The Hague agreement, the principal points of which were already known to the public, and on the 29th the whole question was debated in the Commons. The House listened with indignation to stories either direct from personal knowledge or heard from the lips of others, of barbarous cruelty and neglect in German camps, mines, and fighting zones. Members were particularly moved by the story of Captain Charles Craig who had recently returned from Germany after two years of captivity. The Irish member not only indicted the Germans, but complained bitterly of the past treatment of prisoners by the British Government. The Government, he told the House, had done little or nothing for him and his fellow-captives, and as for the War Office, it was "a corporation without a soul," looking upon prisoners of war as persons of no consideration. On the question of reprisals he said with authority that the vast majority of the prisoners wanted them taken at once against prisoners in this country. His conclusion, cheered by the whole House, was that it must be made quite clear in any armistice that the fullest justice would be done, and that if there were not an instant change reprisals would be taken.

Other members supported Captain Craig's appeal, and Sir George Cave, who replied for the Government, agreed. He fully accepted the indictment that had been presented against the treatment of our men in Germany, and if anything heightened the harsh colouring of the picture by the recital of some hitherto unpublished cases of calculated barbarity. He told of camps where the conditions were unspeakable, the cruelty, inhumanity, and brutality almost past belief. Such things had gone on down to that day, according to the evidence which had come in from lately-returned prisoners. In particular, the record of some of the working parties sent out to factories and mines was very black. The Home Secretary gave an assurance that the Government would endeavour to make certain that when hostilities ceased, whether by peace or by armistice, it should be an essential and primary condition that our prisoners in enemy countries should be immediately released. That condition had been made in the Bulgarian armistice; General Allenby had been instructed in the same sense; and he had the best reason for believing that it would be imposed in any armistice or peace either with Austria or Germany. Finally, Sir George Cave agreed that the guilty must be punished. "We have to take these people by the throat, if we can," he exclaimed, "and let the punishment given to them be an example for generations to come." The Government, he explained, had a list of many of these men, and were taking steps with legal help to put the entries into shape so that they might be available when the time

came. In the matter of reprisals, he gave a hint that the regard in which the Germans hold their officer class would be taken into account if the Government got no response to the demand which they had addressed to Germany.

It was not until November 5 that public feeling in the country was relieved by the announcement that the German Government had at last agreed to ratify The Hague agreement.

Parliament did not, however, limit its care to the British soldier in enemy hands; the soldier at home was also the subject of its solicitation. A new scale of separation allowances was discussed by the House of Commons on October 31, and the Government were sharply criticised for not having shown greater generosity. Mr. Hogge declared that the dependents of our soldiers and sailors were practically the only class who had not received the increased payment to which the higher cost of living entitled them. Mr. Tootill, a Labour member, contended that the inadequacy of the allowances had tended to reduce the *moral* of our fighting men. Other speakers urged that the new scale ought to come into operation at once, instead of being postponed until January 1.

Mr. Barnes replying for the Government stated that one of the grievances which had been brought forward was that no increase had been made to childless wives. Mr. Barnes made the interesting revelation that 390,000 of the 400,000 women in this class had been married during the war. Probably 99 per cent. had never set up any home or lived with their soldier-husbands beyond a week or two. All the Government offices were full of them. He held out no hope of any revision under this head. He promised to see whether it could be arranged that the increased payments, which could not be made until the beginning of the year, should be retrospective. He viewed with favour the suggestion that if women had got into debt in keeping their homes together, they should receive a little additional help. He also announced that the Government were putting forward a scheme for a flat-rate bonus or bounty on top of the pension to compensate for the increased cost of living.

Not merely the material but also the intellectual welfare of the soldier received consideration at the hands of the Government. A Director of Education on the lines of communication in France in the person of Sir Henry Hadow had been appointed as far back as July, and early in September Colonel Lord Gorell, M.C., was appointed to take charge, under Major-General Sir Arthur Lynden-Bell, of a new Department of the Directorate of Staff Duties, formed to direct and to co-ordinate education in the Army. An Inter-Departmental Committee, to which the President of the Board of Education and the Ministers of Labour, Reconstruction, and Pensions nominated representatives, was to advise on general principles, and the Department would have within it Sir Henry Hadow as civil expert, assisted by a sub-committee of other educationists nominated by the

President of the Board of Education. A framework of organisation was at the same time authorised immediately within the forces in Great Britain and France to take advantage of the work already in being and to co-ordinate and develop this as far as might be practicable during the continuance of hostilities.

Meanwhile the possibility of a General Election before the end of the year gradually became more and more of a certainty. The Party Whips began making preparations for such an emergency, and the Labour Party in particular urged its appeal, first issued in June, for contributions to a special fund to be devoted to the General Election effort. But at the proceedings of the National Liberal Federation, held in Manchester in the last week in September, the predominant feeling, to which Mr. Asquith himself gave expression, was against a General Election in the immediate future. A month later it became evident that a General Election was to be reckoned with as a certainty, and the question of the future of political parties and of the Coalition came to be canvassed. A resolution in favour of the maintenance of Coalition government during the period of reconstruction was circulated to every member of the House of Commons, with the exception of the Irish Nationalists, and members in agreement with the movement were invited to append their signatures to the resolution. By November 7, some 155 Liberal, Unionist, and Labour members had endorsed the resolution, while many others accepted the general plea, subject to qualifications either as to the fixing of a time-limit for the continuance of the arrangement or as to the character of the reconstruction programme adopted by the Government.

Another proposal which depended for its urgency on the expected General Election was that women should become eligible as members of Parliament. On October 23 a motion was brought into the House of Commons by Mr. Herbert Samuel to the effect that such a step was desirable. The proposal was but the natural corollary to the decision taken by Parliament earlier in the year to extend the franchise to women, and, although the House had never before discussed the question on its merits, Mr. Herbert Samuel had not proceeded far with the opening speech in support of the proposal before it was obvious that he was preaching to the converted. He argued that women had a distinctive point of view, which ought to have direct expression in Parliament, and his only fear was that too few women would probably be elected to Parliament rather than too many. Women must be 30 years of age before they could exercise the franchise, but Mr. Samuel hoped that no such arbitrary distinctions would apply to their election to Parliament. The women's cause was also strongly pleaded by Lord Robert Cecil, who likewise did not think that a very large number of women would be elected, at any rate for a considerable time, and declared that he would have liked to have seen the resolution expanded, so as to allow women to enter his own profession and that of a solicitor.

Opposition came from Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Peto, who declared that 90 per cent. of the women had not the slightest desire to enter the House or to live under laws made by members of their own sex. Mr. Arnold Ward, on the other hand, intimated that there was no opposition to the proposal from any of the organised forces which had for years conducted a campaign against the enfranchisement of women.

Mr. Asquith supported the motion as the logical outcome of the grant of votes to women. It seemed to him that, as the House had swallowed the camel, it ought not to strain at the gnat. Sir Hedworth Meux, however, contended that the House of Commons was not a fit place for any respectable woman to sit in. But the House was in no mood for pleasantries about Cleopatra, and soon afterwards the motion was carried by 274 votes to 25. It is stated that the only sound that was heard in the Chamber when the figures were announced was an involuntary burst of laughter from the Ladies' Gallery.

As a result of this motion a Bill was introduced in the Commons by Lord Robert Cecil on October 31, "to amend the law with respect to the capacity of women to sit in Parliament." The Bill had only one operative clause, which was in the following terms:—

"A woman shall not be disqualified by sex or marriage for being elected to or sitting or voting as a member of the Commons House of Parliament."

There was no mention of age, and it seemed, therefore, to be contemplated that women, who cannot exercise the franchise until they are 30 years of age, should be eligible for election to Parliament at 21. The Bill became law in due course.

On October 23 an important debate was begun in the House of Lords on the Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms. Lord Midleton moved a resolution declaring for the appointment of a Joint Committee of both Houses to consider and report upon it. The noble lord doubted the expediency of adopting in India Western methods which might be inapplicable to Eastern sentiment and habit, and he denied that "genuine democratic institutions" could exist in the Dependency. Lord Lansdowne, who supported the motion, pronounced the idea that India could ever find a place in the British Empire "alongside the self-governing British Dominions" to be a dream. Lord Islington, speaking for the Government, reminded the House that the Report could not be acted upon without a Bill, and suggested that the appointment of a Joint Committee should be deferred until it had been introduced. On the 24th the debate was continued, and Lord Crewe, a former Secretary of State for India, declined to support the motion, on the ground that the final shape of the Bill founded on the Report would have to be the work of Parliament. Dealing with the merits of the question, he was unable to picture to himself as happening in his lifetime the establishment of Dominion self-government

in India. Lord Selborne regretted the apologetic tone of the Report, and insisted that there was nothing to apologise for in our rule of India. Lord Donoughmore, who accompanied Mr. Montagu on his visit to India, explained that he and his colleagues felt that something must be done to increase the touch of the Government with active life, if possible, from one end of the Peninsula to the other. He combated the theory that Western institutions could never be introduced into India.

Lord Curzon, speaking for the Government, reminded the House that the war had altered the whole atmosphere of life, and declared that it was inconceivable that it should have left no more than a ripple upon the surface of the Indian nation. He resisted the motion on the ground that it would add tenfold to the difficulties of the Government and that it would not be fair play to Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford.

A division was forced, and the Government carried their view by a majority of four in a small House.

One of the most urgent of the Reconstruction problems after the war was that of housing. Local authorities, with the financial aid of the Government, promised sites. Model plans were circulated and the provision of building material received close attention. The House of Commons debated the question again on Monday, October 28, on the second reading of the Housing Bill. The occasion was unique in the history of the House of Commons, inasmuch as women for the first time shared the Strangers' Gallery with men.

Housing was not a new topic in the Commons, neither was the Irish question. This came up again on November 5 when Mr. Dillon and other Nationalists put forward a resolution demanding that before the British Government took part in any Peace Conference for the re-settlement of Europe, the Irish question should be settled in accordance with the principles of self-determination for all nations which President Wilson had laid down and for which the Allies were "ostensibly" fighting. Mr. T. P. O'Connor, who proposed the resolution, argued that the Government which helped to liberate Czecho-Slovaks and Yugo-Slavs should liberate oppressed Irishmen. The resolution, he contended, was the acid test of the sincerity of British political parties.

Mr. Asquith asserted that every Dominion Parliament would pass the resolution with unanimity. He called on the Government, "at this eleventh hour," to give the country an assurance that when they went to the council chamber of peace Ireland would not be a standing reproach, behind the new States now brought to life in the enjoyment of freedom and self-government.

The Chief Secretary for Ireland in his reply declared that the resolution meant that the other Allies were to exclude Great Britain from the Peace Conference because of the failure—due as much to the Irish as to the English—to settle a domestic problem of the United Kingdom. He challenged the National-

ist Party to say what settlement they demanded. Were they prepared to coerce Ulster?

Mr. Dillon retorted that the rest of Ireland was already coerced. Mr. Shortt pressed his question, and drew from Mr. Dillon the admission that he would compel Ulster to submit to the law.

Incidentally some serious statements about the Republican movement in Ireland were made by the Chief Secretary. The Government, he said, had been able to avert an armed rising once, and the physical force party were now coming to the front again.

"I hope [he went on] that we shall be able to prevent anything like an armed rising; but there are the means of it, unless we keep a very firm hold. Only last week at one of the headquarters of the Republican Brotherhood there was seized enough high explosive, with fuses prepared, to blow up all Belfast and Dublin."

Mr. Bonar Law, speaking later in the debate, said that the resolution made an utterly preposterous claim. The Irish question was a domestic matter for the British Empire, and one with which the Government were prepared to deal justly and generously, if only a solution could be found. He denied the right of any Peace Conference to deal with it. On a division, the resolution was rejected by 196 votes to 115, a majority of 81.

No measure of first-class importance occupied the House of Commons during the first week in November. On Thursday, November 7, the Commons were informed that Parliament was to be prorogued shortly. But the announcement did not move the House. Members were much more interested in the Ministry of Health Bill which was introduced by Dr. Addison under the "ten minutes" rule. The measure had little chance of being passed into law that Session, but it was brought forward in order to focus public opinion on an urgent problem. Another measure which was not proceeded with was the Luxury Tax Bill, over which so much pains had been taken by the Select Committee of the House of Commons. An elaborate scheme had been evolved, but in the end, on October 17, Mr. Bonar Law announced that he had reluctantly decided not to ask Parliament to carry the Bill at this stage of the Session. He expressed the hope that such a tax would be included in next year's budget.

The story of events at home in the three months under review in the present chapter must be supplemented by some reference to the step which afforded continuity to the deliberations of the Imperial War Cabinet. The innovation was announced on August 18 in the following terms:—

"During the past two and a half months the Imperial War Cabinet has been in continuous session. Every aspect of policy affecting the conduct of the war and the question of peace has

been examined by the Prime Ministers of the Empire and other members representative of all its parts.

"These meetings have proved of such value that the Imperial War Cabinet have thought it essential that certain modifications should be made in the existing channels of communication, so as to make consultation between the various Governments of the Empire in regard to Imperial policy as continuous and intimate as possible.

"It has therefore been decided that for the future the Prime Ministers of the Dominions, as members of the Imperial War Cabinet, shall have the right to communicate on matters of Cabinet importance direct with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom whenever they see fit to do so.

"It has also been decided that each Dominion shall have the right to nominate a visiting or a resident Minister in London to be a member of the Imperial War Cabinet at meetings other than those attended by the Prime Ministers. These meetings will be held at regular intervals. Arrangements will also be made for the representation of India at these meetings."

The period under review was also marked by a new War Bond campaign which opened on September 30, the date on which the first series of bonds came to an end. Up to Saturday, September 14, the total sale of War Bonds since their first issue on October 2, 1917, was 1,086,830,725*l*. The new campaign was opened at the Guildhall by Mr. Bonar Law and Mr. Balfour, both of whom laid stress on the need for continuing the subscriptions, and referred to the "beginning of the end." "I do not say," Mr. Bonar Law concluded, "that this is the end, but I do say that this is the beginning of the end. The objects which we set out to achieve can all be secured. If there is any danger, it is not on the battle-fronts. We are fighting for peace now and for security for peace in the time to come. You cannot get that by treaty. There can be no peace until the Germans are beaten, and know that they are beaten."

In connexion with the campaign the Post Office made arrangements for post-marking all letters with the words "Feed the guns with War Bonds." This was the motto of the new campaign, and it took the place of the old appeal, "Buy War Bonds now." A feature of the campaign was the transformation of Trafalgar Square into a shell-shattered French village. The battle scene which was reproduced represented what met the eye in every direction at the front. It depicted a ruined farmhouse, riddled with shot and shell holes, and the garden torn up and irretrievably damaged. The building stood where the ornamental fountain used to play, and was surrounded by sandbagged trenches. The Gordon statue was entirely hidden in a ruined church tower. Close by were the trunks of old trees, hollowed by nature, which were being used for observation purposes, and standing on the basin of the west fountain was a windmill, without sails. About 20,000 sandbags were used

to make emplacements and trenches, along which the visitors walked to feed the guns with Bonds and Certificates. The breechloaders and howitzers were ranged along the north side of the square, facing the National Gallery, and each War Bond purchased was specially stamped by a device fitted within the guns for this purpose. On the face of this wall was a huge painting representing "the land which has been completely devastated and desolated," ruined houses, and burning buildings.

The "village" was formally opened on October 7 by the Mayor of Westminster, and the "Feed the Guns" week started magnificently by an application from Sir John Ellerman and the Ellerman Line, Limited, for 500,000*l.* worth of National War Bonds. Other large subscriptions, including one for 500,000*l.* from the P. & O. Company and one for 200,000*l.* from the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, were also registered, and the public was not slow in visiting Trafalgar Square during the week. The total amount of money invested in London during the eight days of the campaign was 29,247,511*l.*

If the spectacle in Trafalgar Square attracted a large number of visitors, the British Scientific Products Exhibition at King's College, which was open from August 12 to September 7, was equally successful, though its appeal was somewhat more limited in scope. Its object was to demonstrate the remarkable developments that had taken place in the scientific industries of the country. The British Science Guild which organised the exhibition desired to show that products which before the war were obtained from Germany were being made in England. Some 250 firms co-operated with the Guild, and the exhibition was therefore rich in many articles. Nothing was sold; the aim of the exhibition being mainly educational. Over 30,000 paid for admission and the results were considered satisfactory.

Another spectacle which also had a war character was the Lord Mayor's Show, celebrated on November 9 in accordance with time-honoured custom. The procession included naval and military detachments, detachments of the Women's Auxiliary Corps, tanks, captured guns, and colonial and allied troops. The whole was intended to be a pageant of the nation's effort in the greatest war in history.

CHAPTER V.

PEACE.

At 11 in the morning on Monday, November 11, London was stirred by the sound of maroons. It was the long-expected signal that Germany had signed the armistice terms. This announcement had been awaited all the previous week, and even as late as Saturday evening (November 9) at the Lord Mayor's banquet, Mr. Lloyd George, who was one of the principal speakers, commenced his speech by saying, "I have no news for

you." The signal was therefore received with great gratification, and though a heavy drizzle of rain came down the whole day, dense crowds turned out towards the centre of the town, and especially towards Buckingham Palace. The first stream of people was composed mainly of civil servants from the Government Offices in Whitehall. But the stream was soon swollen by a miscellaneous crowd. Men and women ran along the Mall or through the Green Park. Others hurried down Constitution Hill or came hustling round from Buckingham Palace Road. Many had already secured flags. Soon there was a triple row on the pavement, and the plinth of the Queen Victoria Memorial was crowded with a cheering throng. Riders came galloping down from the Row and reined up their horses before the Palace. Taxi-cabs and motor-cars drew up, and people who had no claim to them scrambled on to their roofs. Within 10 minutes 5,000 people had assembled, and they began to call for the King.

At a quarter-past 11 a mighty cheer rang out. The King, in the uniform of an Admiral of the Fleet, the Queen, bare-headed, but wearing a fur coat, the Duke of Connaught, and Princess Mary had stepped through a window and were standing on the balcony of the Palace. The Guards in the Courtyard presented arms, the band crashed out the chords of the National Anthem, officers stood at attention, and civilians removed their hats. Men and women took up the refrain joyously and fervently. There came a brief pause, and then the band—that of the Irish Guards—played "Rule Britannia." Again the crowd sang, and above the mass hundreds of flags waved vigorously. When the music ceased the King removed his cap and led a fresh burst of cheering. Enthusiasm became unbounded. The crowd cheered the King, the Queen, and the Princess, groaned for the Kaiser, and cheered again for peace and victory. Ten minutes passed before the demonstration spent itself, and even then a last cheer was raised as the Royal party passed back into the Palace.

Satisfied and gratified the people turned to go, but as they walked away they were met by fresh throngs, flushed with enthusiasm, eager to see and greet their sovereign. Through the park came a procession of munition girls in their overalls, with a tremendous Union Jack. Men with flags tied to sticks and umbrellas, women who had wreathed their hats with the national colours, Dominion soldiers, officers, and men of British regiments, troops from the United States, men of the Royal Air Force, Wrens, W.A.A.C.'s, girls from Government offices, and children poured into the wide open space before the Palace railings. Motor-lorries brought along cheering loads of passengers, some in uniform and some civilians. Motor-cars carried three and four times their normal number of passengers. Every taxi-cab which arrived had half a dozen men and girls on the roof, and soldiers tried to keep precarious places on the steps.

The enthusiasm spread to the City, and at the Mansion House the new Lord Mayor addressed the assembled throng. At the Stock Exchange an immense crowd gathered. The rules which forbid the entrance of the public were relaxed, as is usual on great days, and the House soon became packed with a great concourse of people, estimated at about 5,000, including a number of ladies. The Governor of the Bank, Sir Brien Cokayne, was present, and also members of the Money Market. Here too the National Anthem was sung and cheers given for the King, military and naval leaders, and the Allies. At Westminster, no sooner had prayers been said than the House waited expectantly for the Prime Minister, who immediately rose and read the terms of the armistice. "This is no time for words," said the Prime Minister, in a voice broken with emotion. "Our hearts are too full of gratitude, to which no tongue can give adequate expression." And the House straightway proceeded to St. Margaret's Church to give humble and reverent thanks to Almighty God. A procession was formed, with the Speaker at its head, and the Prime Minister and Mr. Asquith immediately following, and the Commons slowly filed out through St. Stephen's Hall across the crowded road and into the venerable edifice to which through centuries it has repaired at great moments in the nation's history. The House of Lords followed in procession, with the Lord Chancellor at their head. The service was simple and moving. There was no formal order of service, and no sermon.

In the course of the day the King sent congratulatory messages to the Army, the Navy and the Air Force.

Meanwhile the public jubilation extended right into the evening. The thanksgiving and rejoicing continued on Tuesday. As soon as the great news had been received the King expressed a wish to attend a service at St. Paul's. The service was held on Tuesday, and the congregation, including as it did the King, the Queen, and other members of the Royal Family, the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Sheriffs in state, many members of the Corps Diplomatique, many distinguished sailors and soldiers, Ministers and ex-Ministers, and countless numbers of the general public, represented completely and impressively the devout rejoicing of a united people.

The weather was bright again on Tuesday, and many people from the country and the suburbs came to see the decorated City. One of the attractions was the drive of the King and Queen to St. Paul's for the thanksgiving service. Round the Victoria Memorial gathered thousands to welcome their Majesties as they left Buckingham Palace. At the Admiralty Arch were more thousands. In Ludgate Circus and in the nearer neighbourhood of the Cathedral was a throng of corresponding magnitude. The windows of the Law Courts were filled with spectators, and on a balcony stood the Judges in their robes. They had adjourned their Courts while the

procession passed. As it went by they bowed to the King and Queen, and received special acknowledgment. When their Majesties returned to the Palace another splendid welcome awaited them. The crowds, which included a large proportion of oversea soldiers, sent up a great cheer. Shortly afterwards the King and Queen stepped on to the balcony and acknowledged with evident appreciation the enthusiastic loyalty of the crowd.

That evening a band of soldiers, mostly of the overseas forces, lit a bonfire in Trafalgar Square to which a dense throng of onlookers repaired. The general rejoicings continued throughout the week.

On the very day on which the armistice was signed a number of war restrictions were relaxed. All recruiting was suspended; hotels, restaurants, and clubs were permitted, during the week of festivities, to serve meals after 9.30 P.M., and places of entertainment were allowed to be open even after 10.30 P.M.; street lamps were unmasked and the shading of lights in houses was no longer necessary; white bread and an increased sugar ration were promised; building permits began to be granted; racing was quickly resumed; all restrictions on the publication of weather and shipping news were removed; the restrictions on the use of petrol for driving private motor-cars were relaxed; there was a wonderful revival of golf; the press censorship was considerably reduced; certain trade restrictions were modified; even "hunting appointments" reappeared in the daily papers. In the House of Commons Mr. Clynes, the Food Controller, declared that a more varied Christmas table might be expected than last year, with larger supplies of apples, oranges, nuts, and certain other fruits.

More important, however, than these considerations was the problem of the industrial workers after the war. This was one of the first matters which occupied the House of Commons when it got back to business on Tuesday, December 12. Dr. Addison set forth the plans of the Government for the demobilisation of the Army, the resettlement of officers and men in civil life, and the re-establishment of industry on a peace basis. Possibly one of the most far-reaching points was the declaration that the Government had decided to make provision for such unemployment as might occur during the coming months by an out-of-work donation. The scheme was to be in operation for six months for civil workers, and for twelve months after demobilisation for soldiers. The rates of benefit for each class were to be: 24s. a week for men and 20s. a week for women, with additional amounts for dependent children and lower rates for juveniles. As for the release of soldiers, Dr. Addison stated that the general rule would be that those who had places waiting for them would return before those who had no definite prospects. The Ministry of Labour prepared a priority list of industrial groups, placing them in the order of their national importance from the

point of view of the re-establishment on a peace basis of the essential industries of the country. Provision was also made in regard to raw materials. Arrangements were made by the Shipping Controller to make it possible to import as large a quantity of foreign ore as was imported prior to the war. It was proposed to release iron and steel forthwith, and to continue Orders fixing for a period a maximum price for steel. With regard to other metals, there was a sufficient supply available to render it possible to release some from control immediately and nearly all the rest within six months. As for wool, cotton, jute, leather, etc., the situation was expected to be relieved by the reduction in military orders, and by the steps which were being taken by the Shipping Controller to increase the rate of import of these materials.

In the same Session Mr. Bonar Law introduced a vote of credit for 700,000,000*l*. He admitted that the figure had been arrived at on the assumption that the war was going on, without reference to the conclusion of the armistice. Personally, he had no doubt that a lower amount would be spent between then and March 31, the end of the financial year. At the same time, the Treasury could not make sure that the expenditure would be less. They could not count upon any very large decrease in the pay of the *personnel*, and it was obvious that if this was the end of the war, as all thought, some of the expenses of demobilisation would come for payment under the Vote. The Government, of course, were beginning to diminish the expenditure on material of war, but every item of energy available would at once be turned on the production of merchant ships. Again, the conditions were going to be changed with regard to food. An effort might have to be made to bring food supplies to Europe, and greater expenditure under this head would probably be necessary. Finally, he thought we could reasonably assume that at the end of the war the burden of our external debt would not at the outside reach 1,000,000,000*l*.

Another topic on which the House of Commons manifested some anxiety was the shipping position. Mr. Runciman, in introducing the subject on November 14, declared that our net war deficit of 3,500,000 tons represented as grave a problem as was ever faced by a Government Department charged with the duty of keeping up our supplies. He contended that the changes which had come about during the last four years had placed us at a tremendous disadvantage. The United States was building with great rapidity, and he suggested that its ambition was to be possessed of the greatest mercantile fleet in the world. In his view, there was only one means of holding our own against the American flag, and that was by constructing and running our vessels more economically than the Americans. In addition, Scandinavia and Holland had accumulated enormous reserves. He urged that 800 or 900 of the 1,200 merchant ships, which at one time were in the service of the Navy, should be released at

once, and devoted to carrying coal to other countries and bringing back food.

Mr. Holt asked for a definite announcement that shipbuilding was going to be made free, and argued that standard ships had not proved a satisfactory proposition.

Sir L. Chiozza Money, replying for the Government, stated that the Shipping Controller was determined at the earliest possible moment to restore normal conditions in the shipping trade. He announced that it was the policy of the Government to sell Government ships to private owners, and that a beginning had been made. He gave some particularly interesting figures about the convoy system, for the whole period from the date of its inception in the summer of 1917 down to November 2 last. Altogether the convoys included about 47,000,000 gross tons of merchant shipping, and the losses were less than 1·1 per cent. As for the standard ships, 145 had been completed, of which we had got 139 still. Turning to the prospects for the immediate future, Sir L. Chiozza Money explained that, with shipyard workers returning from the front, and a transfer of labour from naval yards to merchant shipping yards, they could reckon upon another 1,000,000 tons a year. In a little while the total output might reach 3,000,000 tons a year.

But the House was deliberating under the shadow of the coming dissolution. One of its last acts before the prorogation was to move (on Monday, Nov. 18) that a humble address be presented to His Majesty, congratulating him on the conclusion of the armistice and the prospect of a victorious peace. The Prime Minister was prevented by a chill from proposing this resolution, and the task devolved on Mr. Bonar Law who declared that the Throne was the link which had kept the Empire together. Mr. Asquith was the only other speaker, and said that when history came to tell the tale of these four years it would recount a story the like of which was not to be found in any literature. Lord Curzon submitted a similar motion in the Lords, which was seconded by Lord Crewe.

The two Houses of Parliament presented their addresses to the King in the Royal Gallery, the most spacious apartment in the Palace of Westminster, and it was unique in English Parliamentary history. In the past, when the Sovereign has had occasion to address Parliament in person, as at the opening of a new Session, he has made his speech from the Throne in the House of Lords, with the peers in their accustomed places and the Commons at the bar. On this occasion Lords and Commons walked in procession from their respective Houses to attend His Majesty, and sat side by side in the Royal Gallery with distinguished representatives of the Dominions and of India on either hand, to hear the King's message to the Empire in an unexampled hour. After the Lord Chancellor and the Speaker had presented the address of their respective Houses, the King replied in a speech which was a message

to the whole Empire. His Majesty thanked both Houses, thanked the peoples of the Empire for their confidence, and pledged himself to uphold the honour of the Empire and to promote the well-being of the people. He then recalled the splendid service rendered by the Army and the Navy, mentioning specially the efforts of the overseas dominions and of India, and concluded with a reference to the new tasks before the nation.

Parliament was prorogued on Thursday, November 21, the King's speech being in the following terms:—

“MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,

“The occasion on which I address you marks the close of a period which will be for ever memorable in the history of our Country.

“The war, upon which all the energies of My Peoples throughout My Dominions have for more than four years been concentrated, has at length been brought to a triumphant issue. The conclusion of an armistice with the last of the Powers that have been ranged against us gives promise at no distant date of an honourable and enduring Peace. I have already sought an opportunity of expressing publicly to My Peoples and to My Allies the sentiments of heartfelt admiration and gratitude with which I regard the supreme and self-sacrificing devotion that has led to this glorious result. Amidst our rejoicing let us not forget to render humble thanks to Almighty God for the success with which it has pleased Him to crown our arms.

“GENTLEMEN OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,

“I thank you for the unfailing patriotism with which you have made provision for the requirements of the war.

“MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,

“The exertions which have carried us to victory in the field must in no wise be abated or slackened until the ravages of war have been repaired, and the fabric of our national prosperity has been restored. Through the extension of the suffrage which this Parliament has carried into effect, all classes of My People will have an opportunity of inspiring and guiding this beneficent undertaking. I trust that the spirit of unity which has enabled us to surmount the perils of war will not be wanting in the no less arduous task of establishing on the sure foundation of ordered liberty the common welfare of My People.

“In bidding you farewell, I pray that the blessing of Almighty God may rest upon your labours.”

The dissolution was announced by Royal Proclamation on Monday, November 25, and a new Parliament summoned for Tuesday, January 21, 1919. Writs for the General Election were issued immediately; Saturday, December 14, was fixed as

the polling day, and Saturday, December 28, the day for counting votes.

The Election campaign had begun even before the prorogation. The great question was, Should the Coalition continue? The Government decided that it should. "If there is to be an election," Mr. Lloyd George had written to Mr. Bonar Law as early as November 2, "I think it would be right that it should be a Coalition Election, that is to say, that the country should be definitely invited to return candidates who undertake to support the present Government not only to prosecute the war to its final end and negotiate the peace, but to deal with the problems of reconstruction which must immediately arise directly an armistice is signed. In other words, the test which in future must decide whether individual candidates will be sustained at the polls by your supporters and mine must be not, as in the past, a pledge to support the Government in the prosecution of the war, but a definite pledge to support this Government. I should myself desire to see this arrangement carried through on personal grounds, for during the last two years I recognise that I have received the whole-hearted support of your party, and that the Government has had a unity both in aims and in action which has been very remarkable in a Coalition Government. I am convinced also that such an arrangement will be the best for the country. The problems with which we shall be faced immediately on the cessation of hostilities will be hardly less pressing, and will require hardly less drastic action than those of the war itself. They cannot, in my opinion, be dealt with without disaster on party lines. It is vital that the national unity which has made possible victory in the war should be maintained until at least the main foundations of national and international reconstruction have been securely laid. A Parliament returned to support a Government constituted as is the present Coalition Government would fulfil, I believe, this essential condition, and would also be possessed both of the necessary authority and unity of purpose alike as to principles and methods, to enable it to deal effectively with the grave problems which will confront it."

The question was further discussed at a great meeting at the Central Hall, Westminster, on Saturday, November 16, where Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Bonar Law, and Mr. Barnes addressed a crowded gathering on the necessity of the Coalition. The Prime Minister stated the broad outlines of the Government's appeal for the renewed confidence of the country at the coming elections. The first necessity, he declared, was that the Government, through the Prime Minister—whatever the Government might be, and whoever the Prime Minister—should represent the country and the Empire at the Peace Conference with full authority. This could not be without an election.

But beyond and more important than even that were the tasks of national reconstruction which await Parliament. The

old "mismanagement," said the Prime Minister, could be tolerated no more. All the elements of the national welfare must be looked to—rates of wages, housing, agriculture, industrial organisation, and the motive-power of industry, transportation, and many others. In these and other essentials the interest of the returned soldier would be as much involved as that of any part of the civilian population.

In work of this kind the pre-war party divisions would be obsolete and obstructive. All, Mr. Lloyd George said frankly, had made mistakes. The best traditions of each should now be combined to inspire united effort. The Government, at the head of the combination of parties which supported them, had ended the war. They now asked for the trust of the people in entering upon the tasks that the war had left as a legacy to the country. Mr. Law and Mr. Barnes both heartily supported the Prime Minister's proposal.

Meanwhile the Labour Party decided to sever itself from the Coalition and withdraw its members from the Government. The Labour Ministers nevertheless continued to support the Government. The Labour campaign commenced on November 14 with a great rally of the forces of Labour at the Albert Hall. Mr. J. McGurk, the Chairman of the National Executive, first requested the audience to stand "in silent remembrance of all those who have died or suffered in the struggle for the emancipation of humanity," and especially "of our comrades in prison everywhere." He declared that if that meeting was a reflex of the enthusiasm throughout the country, then on December 14 Labour would come into its own. "We have to-day at our conference," he said, "settled the fate of the Coalition. We have decided to go to the country as a free and independent party."

"We must make our battle-cry above all else, 'No more war.'" This was the keynote of a speech by Mr. J. H. Thomas, M.P., who expressed the opinion that the decision of Labour to break away from the Coalition was not only a wise decision for the party, but a wise decision for the country. He considered the principle of economic war, and said he wanted the peace terms to include economic conditions that would prevent the German capitalist from exploiting the German worker, and the English capitalist from exploiting the British workers.

The old plea on behalf of the *Internationale* was put forward by Mr. Arthur Henderson, M.P., who asked whether the peace was going to be a peace of justice or a peace of revenge? He claimed the right of the direct representation of Labour at the Peace Conference, and said they wanted, concurrently with the Peace Conference, a World Labour Conference, because they believed then there would be some possibility of getting a peace of justice. "The Government has to-day announced the dissolution of Parliament; Labour has announced the dissolution of partnership. Surely that ought to appeal to every citizen

in this great audience, unless you prefer some other way," he concluded.

Opposition to the Coalition also came from Mr. Asquith and his supporters who determined to appeal to the constituencies as independent Liberals.

There were thus three main groups before the country. The Coalition put over 500 candidates into the field, and there was hardly a constituency in Great Britain in which it was not represented. Mr. Asquith's Opposition Liberals and the official Labour Party had between them some 650 candidates. A number of candidates were also put forward by smaller groups, such as the Co-operative Union, the National Party, and the Federation of Discharged Soldiers and Sailors.

The Election campaign was given direction by the manifesto, issued on November 22 by Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Bonar Law, in the following terms :—

“ TO THE ELECTORS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

“ The Coalition Government, supported by the strenuous and united labours of the whole nation, has now accomplished the gravest portion of its task. Our enemies have been defeated in the field, their armies are broken, and their Governments are overturned. Thanks to the patient valour of the Hosts of Freedom, the knell of military autocracy has sounded for ever in the Continent of Europe.

“ Other tasks directly arising out of the war now await our nation, and can only be surmounted by the good sense, the patriotism, and the forbearance of our people.

“ The unity of the nation, which has been the great secret of our strength in war, must not be relaxed, if the many anxious problems which the war has bequeathed to us are to be handled with the insight, courage, and promptitude which the times demand. As a preliminary to the solution of these problems, it is essential that a fresh Parliament should be summoned, possessed of the authority which a General Election alone can give it, to make the peace of Europe and to deal with the difficult transitional period which will follow the cessation of hostilities. Indeed, the present Parliament has long outstayed its appointed term, and, meanwhile, millions of new voters, including for the first time representatives of the womanhood of the country, have been added to the electorate. It is right that the Government upon whom it devolves, in conjunction with our Dominions and our Allies, to settle the political future of Europe, should be supported by the confidence of the vast body of newly enfranchised citizens.

“ We appeal, then, to every section of the electorate, without distinction of party, to support the Coalition Government in the execution of a policy devised in the interest of no particular

class or section, but, so far as our light serves us, for the furtherance of the general good.

“Our first task must be to conclude a just and lasting peace, and so to establish the foundations of a new Europe that occasion for further wars may be for ever averted.

“The brilliant and conclusive triumph of the Allied Armies will, we hope, render it possible to reduce the burden of our armaments and to release, by successive and progressive stages, the labour and capital of the Empire for the arts of peace. To avert a repetition of the horrors of war, which are aggravated by the onward march of science, it will be the earnest endeavour of the Coalition Government to promote the formation of a League of Nations, which may serve, not only to ensure society against the calamitous results of militarism, but to further a fruitful mutual understanding between the associated peoples.

“Never have the men and women of our race played so great and commanding a part in the affairs of the whole world as during the tempests and trials of this great war, and never has the British name been so widely honoured.

“The care of the soldiers and sailors, officers and men, whose heroism has won for us this great deliverance, and who return to civil life, is a primary obligation of patriotism, and the Government will endeavour to assist such members of the armed forces of the Crown as may desire to avail themselves of facilities for special industrial training and to return to civil life under conditions worthy of their services to the country.

“Plans have been prepared, and will be put into execution as soon as the new Parliament assembles, whereby it will be the duty of public authorities and, if necessary, of the State itself to acquire land on simple and economical bases for men who have served in the war, either for cottages with gardens, allotments, or small holdings, as the applicants may desire and be suited for, with grants provided to assist in training and in initial equipment. In addition to this, we intend to secure and to promote the further development and cultivation of allotments and small holdings generally, so far as may be required in the public interest.

“Increased production must necessarily be the basis of all schemes for the improvement of the conditions of the people. The war has revealed the extent to which the resources of the country have been dissipated and depressed by lack of organisation or by wasteful organisation. It has been demonstrated that the land of the country, if properly cultivated and used, could have yielded food and other products of the soil to a much larger extent. It must be among the first tasks of the new Government to repair this error, which added so much to our difficulties in our struggles against the submarines of the enemy.

“The war has given a fresh impetus to agriculture. This must not be allowed to expire. Scientific farming must be promoted, and the Government regard the maintenance of a

satisfactory agricultural wage, the improvement of village life, and the development of rural industries as essential parts of an agricultural policy.

“Arrangements have been made whereby extensive afforestation and reclamation schemes may be entered upon without delay.

“A systematic improvement in the transport facilities of the agricultural areas must form an essential part of every scheme for the development of the resources of the soil, and the Government are preparing plans with a view to increasing these facilities on a large scale.

“The principal concern of every Government is, and must be, the condition of the great mass of the people who live by manual toil. The steadfast spirit of our workers, displayed on all the wide field of action opened out by the war, in the trenches, on the ocean, in the air, in field, mine, and factory, has left an imperishable mark on the heart and conscience of the nation. One of the first tasks of the Government will be to deal on broad and comprehensive lines with the housing of the people which during the war has fallen so sadly into arrears and upon which the well-being of the nation so largely depends. Larger opportunities for education, improved material conditions, and the prevention of degrading standards of employment; a proper adaptation to peace conditions of the experience which during the war we have gained in regard to the traffic in drink—these are among the conditions of social harmony which we shall earnestly endeavour to promote.

“It will be the fundamental object of the Coalition to promote the unity and development of our Empire and of the nations of which it is composed; to preserve for them the position and influence and authority which they have gained by their sacrifices and efforts in the cause of human liberty and progress; and to bring into being such conditions of living for the inhabitants of the British Isles as will secure plenty and opportunity to all.

“Until the country has returned to normal industrial conditions, it would be premature to prescribe a fiscal policy intended for permanence. We must endeavour to reduce the war debt in such a manner as may inflict the least injury to industry and credit. The country will need all the food, all the raw materials, and all the credit which it can obtain, and fresh taxes ought not to be imposed on food or upon the raw materials of our industry. At the same time a preference will be given to our Colonies upon existing duties and upon any duties which, for our own purposes, may be subsequently imposed. One of the lessons which has been most clearly taught us by the war is the danger to the nation of being dependent upon other countries for vital supplies on which the life of the nation may depend. It is the intention, therefore, of the Government to preserve and sustain, where necessary, these key industries in the way which experience and

examination may prove to be best adapted for the purpose. If production is to be maintained at the highest limit at home, security must be given against the unfair competition to which our industries may be subjected by the dumping of goods produced abroad and sold on our market below the actual cost of production.

"The military institutions of the country must necessarily be dependent upon the needs of the Empire and the prospective requirements of any League for the preservation of Peace to which this country may hereafter be a party. Meanwhile, it will be the aim of the Government to carry through the inevitable reductions in our military and naval establishments with the least possible suffering to individuals and to the best advantage of industry and trade.

"Active measures will be needed to secure employment for the workers of the country. Industry will rightly claim to be liberated at the earliest possible moment from Government control. By the development and control in the best interests of the State of the economical production of power and light; of the railways and the means of communication; by the improvement of the Consular Service; and by the establishment of regular machinery for consultation with representative trade and industrial organisations on matters affecting their interest and prosperity, output will be increased, new markets opened out, and great economies effected in industrial production.

"It will be the duty of the new Government to remove all existing inequalities of the law as between men and women.

"It has been recognised by all parties that reform is urgently required in the constitution of the House of Lords, and it will be one of the objects of the Government to create a Second Chamber which will be based upon direct contact with the people, and will, therefore, be representative enough adequately to perform its functions.

"The people of this country are not unmindful of the conspicuous services rendered by the Princes and people of India to the common cause of civilisation during the war. The Cabinet has already defined in unmistakable language the goal of British policy in India to be the development of responsible government by gradual stages. To the general terms of that declaration we adhere and propose to give effect.

"Ireland is unhappily rent by contending forces, and the main body of Irish opinion has seldom been more inflamed or less disposed to compromise than it is at the present moment. So long as the Irish question remains unsettled there can be no political peace either in the United Kingdom or in the Empire, and we regard it as one of the first obligations of British statesmanship to explore all practical paths towards the settlement of this grave and difficult question, on the basis of self-government. But there are two paths which are closed—the one leading to a complete severance of Ireland from the British

Empire, and the other to the forcible submission of the six counties of Ulster to a Home Rule Parliament against their will. In imposing these two limitations we are only acting in accordance with the declared views of all English political leaders.

"It is a source of pride to be of this age and to be members of this nation. In the whole course of the world's history no generation has been compelled to face sacrifices such as we have steadfastly endured, or perils such as we have victoriously confronted. Well and truly have rich and poor, castle and cottage, stood the ordeal of fire. Right earnestly do we trust that the united temper, the quiet fortitude, the high and resolute patriotism of our nation may be long preserved into the golden times of peace.

"D. LLOYD GEORGE.

"A. BONAR LAW."

On the very next day (November 23) two resignations were announced from the Government. Mr. Clynes resigned the office of Food Controller and Lord Robert Cecil that of Assistant Foreign Secretary. Mr. Clynes was moved by party interest: consideration for the future of the Labour movement weighed with him. With Lord Robert Cecil it was a case of conscience: Lord Robert was unable to support the Government's policy in regard to the disestablishment of the Church in Wales. It should be added that in his letter to the Prime Minister announcing his resignation Lord Robert wrote, "Except on this one point, I remain a convinced supporter of the Government." Soon afterwards Mr. Hodge and Mr. Brace, two other Labour members of the Government, followed the example of Mr. Clynes.

All over the country the period between the dissolution and the date of the Election saw the campaign in full swing. Electioneering speeches were made by leaders and their lieutenants almost every day. The Labour Party was particularly busy. The National Executive issued a manifesto on November 28, headed "Labour's Call to the People." The Labour Party declared that its challenge was against reaction; that it advocated a peace of reconciliation, demanded freedom for Ireland, the abolition of conscription, the nationalisation of land, the provision of good houses at the expense of the State, and a levy on capital. "Labour," the manifesto stated, "is firm against Tariffs and for Free Trade," and concluded with these words: "Labour's programme is comprehensive and constructive. It is designed to build a new world, and to build it by constitutional means. It is a programme of national and international justice, founded on permanent democratic principles. Even in an election as sinister as this, in which a large part of the nation's youth is arbitrarily disfranchised by the Government, Labour confidently appeals to the country to support its programme of social justice and economic freedom."

A new departure was made by the Labour Party at this Election in that they utilised newspaper advertisements to bring before the electors points of their policy. In this connexion it is of interest to note that the *Daily Mail* offered the Labour Party the full use of one column of that paper every day "in order that their views may be properly and promptly put before the country." The offer was accepted.

In Ireland likewise there was much activity, the outstanding feature of which was the campaign of Sinn Fein, which had put forward candidates for nearly every seat in the island.

Another characteristic of the Election was the important part played in it by women. Not only did women voters take part in an Election for the first time, but for the first time also in the history of the country there were women candidates. Sixteen obtained nomination. So influential was the women's vote held to be that the Prime Minister arranged at the Queen's Hall a special meeting for women electors which he addressed. Mr. Barnes addressed a similar meeting at Glasgow, and Mr. Asquith a gathering of Liberal women at Lincoln.

Not content with the manifesto issued by himself and Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Lloyd George sent to the press another statement of the policy of the Coalition. He expressed the thanks of the nation to its fighting men, declared that the Kaiser must be prosecuted, and that the Central Powers should pay the cost of the war up to the limit of their capacity; advocated the expulsion of enemy aliens; proposed that ample provision should be made for returned soldiers and sailors; and laid stress on the need for increased national production, on profit-sharing, on improved housing, on attention to the health of the people, on increased education and on the continuation of rural development. This may have defined the issues, yet on the eve of the Election (on December 10) Mr. Lloyd George summed up the Coalition programme in the following points: (1) Trial of the Kaiser; (2) Punishment of those responsible for atrocities; (3) Fullest indemnities from Germany; (4) Britain for the British, socially and industrially; (5) Rehabilitation of those broken in the war; and (6) A happier country for all. In many quarters it was taken amiss that the Prime Minister made no reference to the abolition of conscription, and his political opponents made capital out of this omission. On the Election day, however, a message from the Prime Minister appeared in the press in which he stated, "I wish to make it clear beyond all doubt that I stand for the abolition of conscript armies in all lands."

From the first it was taken for granted that the Coalition would have a sweeping majority. The only question at issue was the strength and the composition of the Opposition. Never before had there been so many three-cornered contests; they were the rule this time rather than the exception. More than 1,500 candidates offered themselves for the 600 contested seats.

December 14 was a rainy day, yet the polling was heavy,

and it was remarked that the women voters were very much to the fore. In some London districts the women electors outnumbered the men by 20 to 1. On this occasion the proceedings were quiet; the busy Election traffic of bygone days was conspicuously absent. The result was full of surprises. The Coalition obtained a sweeping majority; the Liberal opposition suffered a bad defeat, Mr. Asquith himself, and very many of the prominent Liberal statesmen, not being returned; Labour polled heavily and came back to the House greatly strengthened, though it lost its leader, Mr. Arthur Henderson, and the principal advocates of pacifism; while in Ireland the Sinn Feiners won in all the constituencies save six which the Nationalists were able to retain. Only one woman secured election, and she was a Sinn Fein candidate. A large number of voters failed to record their vote, and this was regarded as showing not only the apathy of a considerable section of the civil population, but also the virtual disfranchisement of a large body of men in the Army under the conditions then existing.

The results of the Election were analysed by *The Times* and the *Manchester Guardian* respectively as follows:—

The Times LIST.THE *Manchester Guardian* LIST.

| COALITION. | | | | | | COALITION OFFICIAL LIST. | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|------|
| Unionists | - | - | - | - | 338 | Unionists | - | - | - | - | 342 |
| Liberals | - | - | - | - | 136 | Liberals | - | - | - | - | 136 |
| National Democrati Party | - | - | - | - | 10 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 484 | | | | | | 478 |
| | | | | | | Unionists | - | - | - | - | 51 |
| | | | | | | Liberals | - | - | - | - | 27 |
| | | | | | | Labour | - | - | - | - | 59 |
| | | | | | | Coalition Labour | - | - | - | - | 3 |
| | | | | | | Socialist | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| | | | | | | Co-operator | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| | | | | | | Silver Badge | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| | | | | | | National Party | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| | | | | | | Independents | - | - | - | - | 3 |
| | | | | | | Nationalists | - | - | - | - | 7 |
| | | | | | | Sinn Fein | - | - | - | - | 73 |
| | | | | | *706 | | | | | | *706 |

* Excluding Kennington.

For the United Kingdom as a whole the party changes (as recorded by the *Manchester Guardian*) stood as follows:—

| | Last Parliament. | New House. |
|--------------|------------------|------------|
| Unionists | 287 | 395 |
| Liberals | 261 | 163 |
| Labour Party | 38 | 59 |
| Other Labour | — | 5 |
| Nationalists | 77 | 7 |
| Sinn Fein | 7 | 73 |
| Independents | — | 4 |
| | 670 | 706 |

How the votes were cast is indicated by *The Times* analysis for Great Britain:—

| COALITION. | | | | | NON-COALITION. | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|-----------|----------------|---|---|---|-----------|
| Unionists | - | - | - | 3,484,269 | Unionists | - | - | - | 365,982 |
| Liberal | - | - | - | 1,445,738 | Liberal | - | - | - | 1,298,808 |
| National Democratic Party | | | | 161,521 | Labour | - | - | - | 2,374,385 |
| | | | | | Other | - | - | - | 550,311 |
| | | | | <hr/> | | | | | <hr/> |
| | | | | 5,091,528 | | | | | 4,589,486 |

A further analysis for Great Britain, given by a correspondent of the *Daily News*, is also worth recording :—

| Party. | | Votes. | Members Actually Returned. | Membership Actually Represented by Votes. |
|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|--|
| Coalition | Unionists - - - - | 3,701,855 | 309 | 221 |
| " | Liberals - - - - | 1,590,480 | 133 | 95 |
| Liberals | - - - - | 1,335,620 | 28 | 79 |
| Labour | - - - - | 2,482,566 | 62 | 148 |
| Unionists | - - - - | 269,689 | 50 | 16 |
| Independent Labour | - - - - | 232,754 | 10 | 14 |
| Independents | - - - - | 473,547 | 9 | 28 |
| | | | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| | | | 601 | 601 |

While the Election campaign was in progress, the Army began slowly to return home. Prisoners of war arrived from Germany; by the end of November 494 officers and 14,235 other ranks were officially stated to have returned. The first party were received at Dover on November 17, by the Prince of Wales, who conveyed to the men a message from the King and Queen. But the men still with the colours also received attention. Demobilisation began on December 11 at Wimbledon Common, and men who were urgently needed in industry and men over 41 were drafted out first. Four other dispersal stations were set up in England besides Wimbledon—Shorncliffe, Chisleton, Oswestry, Ripon—and one in Scotland—Duddingston. Arrangements were made to provide each man with twenty-eight days' furlough with pay, ration, and family allowances; out-of-work insurance, operative for a year from the date of discharge and payable for twenty weeks; a railway warrant for the journey home; any gratuities which might be due; and a protection and identity certificate.

The Industrial army was a problem by itself. As early as November 13 the Prime Minister addressed a meeting, under the chairmanship of Mr. G. N. Barnes, composed of representatives of employers' associations and trade unions in the principal industries of the country. Mr. G. H. Roberts, Minister of Labour, Mr. Balfour, and Dr. Addison, Minister of Reconstruction, were also present. Two main points were dealt with by Mr. Lloyd George—the question of making provision for carrying out pledges given by the Government as to trade union rules, and that of determining a policy of wages, owing to the fact that, with the change-over from munitions work to private work, the rates of wages which had been fixed by awards and orders under the Munitions of War Act would cease to have effect.

Wages indeed formed the main topic of interest with workers,

especially munition workers. It was on the question of wages in the future that some 6,000 women munition workers marched to Whitehall, on November 19, to interview the Prime Minister. They asked for a living wage while working and for an adequate maintenance allowance on discharge. Similar processions were recorded on December 4. The Prime Minister in each case received deputations with whom he discussed some of the points about which the women workers were concerned. So pressing did the question become that on behalf of the Women's Industrial League, Lady Rhondda (early in December) submitted a memorial to the Prime Minister on the claims of women to freedom of employment in industry. It was admitted that these claims came after those of sailors and soldiers, and of the skilled men who trained and helped the women in war work. Mr. Lloyd George, in reply, stated that when the pledges to the trade unions had been fulfilled women would find ample scope in peace pursuits. In the new industries arising, no discrimination was to be made against women. He supported the principle of "equal pay for equal output," and promised full opportunities for women in training and education.

Meanwhile the men workers also showed signs of restiveness. As early as November 21 the press published the announcement that the Executive Committee of the National Union of Railwaymen had decided to withdraw the truce entered into with the railway companies and the Government, and commence negotiations in respect of the national programme adopted at the Leicester conference. The eight-hour day question likewise became acute. One of the conditions of the settlement of the threatened strike in September was a promise by the Government that the question of an eight-hour working day would be taken into consideration within a month of the cessation of hostilities. The Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen began to press for the immediate initiation of the eight-hour system on the railways. The Government quickly conceded this demand (Dec. 6), which also included time and a quarter pay for overtime work, the new arrangement to take effect on February 1, 1919.

Hardly had the difficulties on the railways been overcome when dissatisfaction made itself felt in the cotton industry (Dec. 8). The cause of the dispute was a difference of opinion between the employers and the men in regard to the basis for an advance in wages. The employers made an offer of a 40 per cent. advance on standard rates, but the operatives declined to alter their demand for a 40 per cent. advance on current wages, the difference being about 15 per cent. An offer by the employers to submit this difference to arbitration was not accepted by the labour representatives. Eventually the Prime Minister intervened in the conflict, and a basis for a settlement was reached. The terms arranged were that from December 21 an advance of 50 per cent. should be paid on standard lists, and

that where there were no piece lists the advance should be 30·3 per cent. on current wages. On December 19 the strike ended and the mills re-opened.

Meanwhile the influenza epidemic continued, though towards the end of November its ravages abated. Nor was the cry for economy stilled. The public continued to be urged not to relax their efforts to save coal and light. More important still, there was a call by the National War Savings Committee for continued saving. "The development of the habit of saving has been one of the most marked features of war conditions in this country, as is evidenced by the fact that the number of holdings of Government securities has increased from 345,100 on the opening of hostilities to over 17,000,000 to-day." So wrote Sir R. M. Kindersley, the chairman of that committee, on November 16, and he announced at the same time that the issue of War Savings Certificates would be continued and the war-saving scheme would become permanent. In this connexion it may be mentioned that the collection of Red Cross pearls for which an appeal had been made earlier in the year was sold by auction on December 19, and the proceeds went, without any deduction, to the funds of the Red Cross.

As was but to be expected, Christmas was particularly merry this year. The festival was made the occasion of giving full and most appropriate scope to the universal thanksgiving and rejoicing that the darkest shadow which had ever fallen athwart the nation's fortunes had happily lifted and passed away. The weather on Christmas Day was sunny and crisp, with a seasonable touch of frost. The nation's gladness was heightened by the announcement, on December 25, of the betrothal of Princess Patricia, one of the most popular of royal ladies, and by the visit of President Wilson.

The President of the United States was the last of a number of distinguished visitors who came to the country in December. On the first of the month Londoners turned out, though heavy rain poured, to welcome M. Clemenceau, Marshal Foch, Signor Orlando, and Baron Sonnino. All four had a strikingly enthusiastic popular reception; and all were received by the Queen at Buckingham Palace and by Queen Alexandra at Marlborough House, the King being then still in France. The purpose of the visit was to prepare for the Inter-Allied Peace Preliminaries Conference which was to meet in Paris.

On the 10th the Emir Feisul, third son of the King of the Hedjaz, arrived in London for the purpose of presenting the respects of his father to the King. The Prince was entertained largely during his stay which lasted a fortnight.

Warm as was the reception given to these visitors it naturally could not compare with that accorded to Sir Douglas Haig and the commanders of the British armies on the Western Front who came home officially on December 19. At Dover, where the returning Generals landed and were greeted by cheering crowds, Sir

Douglas Haig paid a high tribute to "the wonderful men whose unequalled courage and endurance have brought us at length by victory to peace." In London the reception of the party was of a notable character. They drove through crowded streets to Buckingham Palace, where the King and Queen entertained them at luncheon. At Sir Douglas and Lady Haig's home at Kingston a torchlight procession welcomed them.

If gratitude was the predominant feeling of the crowds which witnessed the arrival of Sir Douglas Haig and his party, intense respect and admiration was the characteristic of the crowds which enthusiastically cheered President Wilson on his arrival in London on December 26. *The Times* remarked that the President's visit was "one of the greatest events in our own and in American history." Never before had a President of the United States visited these shores; and it was only to be expected that the nation would rise to the occasion. Mr. and Mrs. Wilson stayed at Buckingham Palace as the guests of the King and Queen, both of whom were present at Charing Cross Station to welcome the visitors. On Friday evening a State banquet was given at the Palace in their honour, and in his reply to the King's toast, President Wilson declared: "The welcome which you have given me and Mrs. Wilson has been so warm, so natural, so evidently from the heart that we have been more than pleased; we have been touched by it, and I believe that I correctly interpret that welcome as embodying not only your own generous spirit towards us personally, but also as expressing for yourself and the great nation over which you preside that same feeling for my people, for the people of the United States."

On Saturday the President and Mrs. Wilson visited the City at midday, and had dinner with the Prime Minister and the Imperial War Cabinet in the evening. At the Guildhall the President was presented with an address from the City of London. Directly he appeared in the Council Chamber the President received a stirring demonstration of welcome. The proceedings in the Council Chamber were followed by a luncheon in the Egyptian Hall, and both celebrations were marked by special cordiality both on the part of the crowds in the street and of the guests at the functions.

On Sunday, December 29, President Wilson was in Carlisle, in order to visit the place where his mother had been born. From Carlisle he proceeded to Manchester, where once more, on the Monday, he was given a magnificent reception. A streamer spread across the whole of the Market Street side of the Royal Exchange conveyed to Mr. Wilson the message: "The industrial capital of England has a warm corner in its heart for you." The President was interested in a visit to the Ship Canal; he made a call at the Royal Exchange; and in the presence of a great assembly in the Free Trade Hall was presented with the freedom of Manchester. In returning thanks for the honours Mr. Wilson said, among other things: "There is a feeling of

cordial fraternity and friendship between the two great nations, and as I have gone from place to place and been made everywhere to feel the pulse of sympathy that is now beating between us, I have been led to some very serious thoughts as to what the basis of it all is. For I think you will agree with me that friendship is more than sentiment. Patriotism is not mere sentiment. It is based upon a principle that leads a man to give more than he demands. And, similarly, friendship is based not merely upon affection, but upon common service."

On the last day of the year the President returned to France. Perhaps the burden of his message to this country may be best expressed in words he uttered at Manchester, words which may also fittingly close this survey of a remarkable year in English History :—

"I believe," President Wilson said, "that . . . men are beginning to see, not perhaps the golden age, but an age which at any rate is brightening from decade to decade, and will lead us some time to an elevation from which we can see the things for which the heart of mankind is longing."

FOREIGN AND COLONIAL HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

FRANCE AND ITALY.

I. FRANCE.

NEVER in all its history did the French nation display greater courage or greater unanimity than during the wearisome years of the European War. And at the beginning of the year 1918, no considerable weakening of the French spirit was to be observed. It is true that since the German peace offer of December, 1916, there had been a change of attitude on the part of the Socialist Party. But the persons thus influenced formed only a small minority of the nation, and the essential unanimity and the fixed determination of the nation to pursue the war to a victorious termination were not thereby seriously impaired.

During the year 1917 the course of events had sharpened the division between the mass of the nation and the Socialist Party. At the beginning of that year it was only a minority of the Socialists who had gone into opposition. This minority had held that the German peace offer ought not to have been rejected without further consideration; and after the offer had been made they came rapidly to the position adopted by the small peace party in Great Britain, and by the Official Socialists in Italy, namely, that the war ought to be concluded on the basis of a compromise with the Central Powers. The difference of opinion thus formed was accentuated later by the revolution in Russia which was greeted much more warmly by the Socialists than by the other parties. In particular, the Socialists had been heartily in favour of the Russian and neutral proposal to hold a Peace Conference of Socialists in Stockholm, and they had bitterly resented the refusal of the French Government to allow them to proceed to that proposed Conference. Finally, the Socialist Party separated themselves from the sentiments of other Frenchmen on the question of Alsace-Lorraine. They adopted officially the much-discussed suggestion that that vexing territorial problem ought to be closed by giving the people of the two provinces the right to decide by plebiscite what their own destiny should be.

As the year proceeded the great majority of Socialists came

to adhere more or less closely to this new policy, which as already stated, had originally been advocated only by a minority. The evolution of the other parties was in the reverse direction. And after several changes of Government the Premiership fell in November to M. Georges Clemenceau. The latter statesman was famous not only in France but in all Europe for his determined character and for the strength of his foreign policy; and vigorous though the French Government had been before, it became even more determined and unyielding under his leadership. And M. Clemenceau was not only convinced of the necessity of waging the war against Germany to a decisive victory, but also deemed it essential to check, by stern measures if necessary, the spread of the pacifist movement in France. It was the assumption of office by a statesman of the character of M. Clemenceau which finally caused almost the whole of the Socialist Party to go into opposition. M. Clemenceau had appointed M. Pichon as Foreign Secretary.

A debate which took place in the Chamber of Deputies on January 11 brought out the differences of what may now be correctly called the two French parties. Several interpellations, dealing with the Government's refusal of passports to Petrograd and with the diplomatic conduct of the war generally, were addressed to the Government on that day by the Socialist deputies, M. Mayeras, M. Cachin, M. Thomas, and M. Renaudel. M. Mayeras contended that the lack of sympathy which the Government had shown to the Russian revolutionaries, and the fact that the French Government by its attitude had seemed to support those who would change the Entente's war of defence into a war of aggression, had contributed in an important manner to the deplorable prolongation of the war. M. Albert Thomas also declared that the Allied Governments should state their war aims in concise terms, and that those terms should give no colour to the German Government's contention that the Central Powers were waging a war of defence.

In reply to these interpellations M. Pichon made a long speech. He declared that the French Government were in agreement with the war aims laid down by Mr. Lloyd George and Dr. Wilson. The French Ministry were, for instance, in agreement with Dr. Wilson's proposal that Germany should be admitted to the future Society of Nations so soon as she had abolished her military caste. In reference to the refusal of passports to Russia, the speaker averred that these could not be granted in existing circumstances because the new Government in Petrograd had torn up all its treaties and was not recognised by any of the Allied Governments nor by the United States Government. Moreover, the French Ministry must condemn the idea of an International Socialist Conference, for they could not think of "permitting this contact with the accomplices of the authors of the world calamity." It would be playing the German game for the Allies to go to Brest-Litovsk, for

the Germans had made every possible effort to induce them to go there.

At the end of this interesting debate a vote of confidence in the Ministry was passed by 397 votes to 145.

During the autumn of 1917 public opinion had been much perturbed by the evidence of treasonable conspiracies which had been unearthed by the Government, and more particularly by M. Clemenceau himself. The persons implicated were, in the first instance, a certain notorious Bolo Pasha and the managers of a paper named the *Bonnet Rouge*. Accusations were, however, also made against M. Malvy, a deputy who had been Minister of the Interior as lately as the summer of the same year. And, finally, a tremendous sensation was caused by an official accusation of treason against M. Joseph Caillaux, the well-known statesman who had formerly been Prime Minister of France and who had always been reputed to be favourable to the idea of a *rapprochement* with Germany. On December 22 M. Caillaux's Parliamentary Immunity was suspended, and he was arrested at his house in Paris on January 14. It was made known at once that the accusations against him related to his activities in Italy and Argentina during the war, and it was alleged that he had entered into communication directly or indirectly with the enemy.

A series of sensational trials followed these arrests. The first trial was that of Bolo Pasha which commenced on February 4. Bolo was a remarkable, if wholly unscrupulous man. He had lived by his wits, quite untroubled by conscience, from his earliest years. He first practised as a Dental Surgeon in Marseilles, he then kept different kinds of shops, and at one time was the proprietor of a restaurant. He carried out various ingenious swindles, for the most part escaping without punishment. He had been twice married, the second ceremony taking place whilst the first wife was yet alive, and without the formality of a divorce. His second wife had been extremely wealthy, and it was with her money that he had first engaged in business on a large scale. Most of his enterprises were unsuccessful, however, and at the beginning of the war he was in serious financial difficulties. In these circumstances he was quite ready to listen to proposals from agents of the German Government.

At various times Bolo had travelled all over the world, and the case against him, which was based upon discoveries made by the American Secret Service, was that whilst he was in the United States he had received large sums, totalling altogether over 336,000*l.*, from the emissaries of Count Bernstorff, then German Ambassador to the United States. The trial attracted a great deal of attention in Paris, and during the proceedings Bolo proved that he lacked neither resource nor courage. The Counsel for the prosecution was a certain Lieut. Mornet. In the opinion of the Court Martial Lieut. Mornet was able to substantiate the charges that Bolo had entered into communica-

tion with the enemy through the Ex-Khedive of Egypt, a certain Signor Cavallini, and other persons, and had conspired to create a defeatist movement in France, more particularly by purchasing the *Journal*, and by attempting to obtain control of the *Figaro*. It is worth noting that these secret proceedings appeared to have been controlled by Herr von Jagow himself, then German Foreign Secretary. On February 9 M. Caillaux was brought from prison to give evidence for the defence, but that statesman was not able to make any disclosures which seriously influenced the proceedings. The most dramatic moment in the trial was, however, two days later when the accused's brother Mgr. Bolo (who was a well-known preacher in Paris) gave evidence in his brother's defence. Considerable sympathy was expressed for Mgr. Bolo, but he was unable to destroy the case made out by Lieut. Mornet, and on February 14 the Court Martial (which consisted of seven judges, Colonel Voyer being the president) found the prisoner guilty and condemned him to death. His associate Cavallini was also condemned to death. Bolo was shot at Vincennes on April 17.

On March 1 there were great celebrations in Paris and elsewhere of the 47th Anniversary of the famous protest of the deputies of Alsace and Lorraine at Bordeaux in 1871. On this occasion a speech of considerable interest was made by M. Pichon, the Foreign Minister. M. Pichon made two revelations as to the past relations between Germany and France in regard to the border territories. The first revelation, of which indeed something was already known, consisted of a quotation from a letter of the Emperor William I to the Empress Eugenie, the letter being dated October 26, 1870, from Versailles. M. Pichon referred to this subject in order to refute the current German argument, used by Count Hertling and others, that in annexing Alsace-Lorraine Germany had merely been recovering what was in reality historic German territory. The quotation from the letter was as follows :—

“After having made immense sacrifices for her defence, Germany wishes to be certain that the next war will find her better prepared to throw back the attack which she may expect as soon as France has re-made her strength and acquired allies. It is this sorrowful motive alone and not the desire to aggrandise a country and territory which are large enough, which forces me to insist upon territorial concessions which have no other object but that of pushing farther back the starting-point of the French armies which will come to attack us in future.”

The speaker said that it was clear from this that those who actually annexed Alsace-Lorraine certainly did not regard it in the light of merely retaking a country which was German.

The second revelation was of a still more startling character. This was an incident in the negotiations between the French and German Governments before the outbreak of the war, and consisted of an instruction sent by Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg

to Baron von Schoen (German Ambassador in Paris) on July 31, 1914. M. Pichon said that the French Government had only recently become aware of this instruction. It will be remembered that the German Government had endeavoured to persuade France to remain neutral in the war between Russia and the Central Powers. The Chancellor's instruction to the German Ambassador was as follows :—

“If the French Government declares that it will remain neutral, Your Excellency will kindly state that we must, as a guarantee of that neutrality, demand the handing over of the fortresses of Toul and Verdun, which we shall occupy, and hand back on the conclusion of the war with Russia. The reply to this last question must have reached here before 4 o'clock on Saturday.”

M. Pichon said that this revelation made it clear that even if France had had the perfidy to desert her ally, Russia, the German Government would have immediately proceeded to attempt to impose dishonouring conditions upon her.

It appeared from the comments on this latter revelation by the German Press, that the idea involved caused little surprise in Germany, and was greeted indeed with approval. It was held in leading German circles that in the circumstances supposed, material guarantees of French neutrality would obviously have been necessary.

The second great treason trial was that of the persons connected with the *Bonnet Rouge* newspaper, the most prominent figure being that of Duval, who had been manager of the journal. This trial opened on April 29. The prisoners were tried by the Third Court Martial of France, and as in the Bolo trial, Lieut. Mornet appeared for the prosecution. Colonel Voyer again presided. M. Almeyreda, the proprietor of the *Bonnet Rouge*, had been arrested in the previous year, but he had died in prison, under mysterious circumstances. Duval was charged with having had commerce and intelligence with the enemy. It transpired in the course of the trial that he had received sums amounting to 40,000*l.* from a Mannheim banker, named Marx. He received these cheques through Switzerland, and with the funds thus procured an active defeatist campaign was carried on in the *Bonnet Rouge*, which began to appear daily instead of weekly. The tone of the paper was such as to spread pessimism, and particularly to cause dissatisfaction with the efforts being made by Great Britain. The attempt of the defence to explain away the cheques received through Switzerland was quite unavailing. It appeared that Duval had met Marx in Switzerland no fewer than ten times. The passports to Switzerland had been secured through another of the prisoners, M. Leymerie, who had been Chef-de-Cabinet to M. Malvy, when the latter was Minister of the Interior. On May 14 M. Caillaux gave evidence on certain minor points connected with another of the prisoners named Landau. On May 15 the

prisoners were found guilty on various counts, Duval himself being sentenced to death. Leymerie received a sentence of two years' imprisonment, and the five other prisoners were given terms varying from two to ten years.

The next trial was that of M. Malvy, which commenced on July 17. The trial was before the Senate as a High Court. The accusation was one of treason, and it had been brought against M. Malvy originally by M. Léon Daudet, a well-known Royalist, and editor of the *Action Française*. Daudet had written a letter to the President making a general accusation of treason against Malvy, and in particular accusing him of betraying to the enemy the plans of the unfortunate offensive in Champagne in April, 1917. The charges were now made legally by the Public Prosecutor, M. Mérillon, and the President of the Senate, M. Dubost, presided. The trial caused less sensation than some had anticipated, however, because M. Mérillon abandoned at the outset the more serious charges brought by Daudet, and limited himself to accusations of lax administration. The prosecution was only partially successful. On July 29 both M. Viviani and M. Briand (ex-Premiers) appeared as witnesses for the defence, and paid tributes to the integrity of the accused. On August 6 the trial was concluded, and the Senate acquitted Malvy of all the charges of treason, but found him guilty of culpable negligence in the discharge of his official duties, and sentenced him to five years' banishment, without civic degradation.

On April 4 the Chamber of Deputies adopted the Budget for 1918. The amount of the expenditure (excluding war-expenditure) was estimated at no less than 335,139,000*l.*, which was expected to cover the interest on the now greatly swollen national debt. The French Debt at the beginning of 1918 was 4,606,000,000*l.* A new war loan, issued in the autumn, produced subscriptions amounting to 1,100,000,000*l.*, of which 790,000,000*l.* represented "new money."

On June 4 an important debate took place in the Chamber of Deputies, and M. Clemenceau made a speech covering a wide range of policy. The Premier said that after the defection of Russia it was inevitable that the French Army and its Allies would be compelled to withstand a terrible German onslaught, and it was not to be wondered at that the line had been pressed back in some places. The Army, both soldiers and leaders, had fought admirably, and had done better even than was anticipated. The Government had always realised the severity of the struggle, but they would never yield. Their Allies were powerful and numerous, and the final victory would be won by France, notwithstanding recent reverses.

After this speech a vote of confidence in the Government was passed by 377 votes to 110, the minority consisting of the Socialists, 18 Radical-Socialists, and a few discontented Radicals.

At the end of September the French Government published

particulars of the old Dual Alliance concluded in 1893 between France and Russia. It appeared that by the terms of this alliance France and Russia agreed to support one another if either were attacked by Germany alone, or if France were attacked by Italy supported by Germany, or again, if Russia were attacked by Austria-Hungary supported by Germany. France and Russia also agreed not to conclude peace separately with the Triple Alliance. It was apparently anticipated at that time that France would be able to put 1,300,000 men against Germany, and that Russia would be able to put 700,000 to 800,000 against Germany. It was agreed that the terms of the Treaty should be kept rigorously secret.

On September 17 M. Clemenceau made a long speech in the Senate. He spoke with great pride of the recent victories of the French armies. He referred to the German crimes in terms of the strongest condemnation. He said that some were murmuring that there could be no peace by a military decision. That was not what the Germans had said when they had let loose this war. Then let it be as Germany had willed. They all desired peace, but the peace must be a just and lasting peace, and a peace of victory.

At the beginning of October a Congress of the Socialist Party was held. And this Congress was notable in that the more extreme section of the party, that led by M. Longuet, succeeded in obtaining a majority for its policy. M. Longuet was an advocate of an Internationalist policy, and the resolutions proposed by him at the Congress stated that the Socialists in Parliament ought to oppose any Government which obstructed the convening of an International Socialist Congress. The resolution also condemned the intervention of the Allies in Russia.

On November 11, the day on which the armistice was concluded, scenes of great enthusiasm were witnessed in Paris and throughout France. It appears that it was not until nearly twenty minutes past eleven that the booming of the guns notified the people of the capital that hostilities had ceased, and it is said that during those twenty minutes of somewhat inexplicable delay the Parisians were in a state of considerable anxiety lest some hitch had occurred in the course of the final negotiations with the Germans. After that hour, however, the crowds in the streets were delirious with enthusiasm. There was also great excitement and enthusiasm in both Houses of Parliament. The Prime Minister read the terms of the armistice in the Chamber of Deputies, and then made a short speech on the victorious conclusion of the war. M. Clemenceau said: "I shall now only add a few words. In the name of the French people and the French Republic, greetings to France, one and indivisible, to France liberated by the power of arms, to Alsace-Lorraine, and then honour to our great dead. France has been liberated by the power of arms. Let us salute our heroes of

yesterday, soldiers of God, and our heroes of to-day, soldiers of humanity. Our soldiers will always be soldiers of the ideal."

The President of the Chamber, M. Deschanel, said that they "hailed this sacred hour for which we have been waiting for forty-seven years, forty-seven years during which Alsace-Lorraine, forbidden freedom of speech, still continued without ceasing, to call on France." The speeches in the Senate, as also subsequent speeches in the Chamber, paid eloquent tribute to the services which M. Clemenceau and Marshal Foch had rendered to France.

After the conclusion of the armistice, the mind of France was naturally concentrated chiefly upon the two provinces now recovered from Germany. As early as November 13, the members of the Lower House of the Alsace-Lorraine Diet met at Strasbourg and constituted themselves into a National Assembly. They also appointed a provisional administration of the two provinces. The march of the French troops through Alsace-Lorraine to the Rhine was accompanied by every pageantry and formality which could assist in making it impressive and historic. And it was reported that the French armies were received with enthusiasm everywhere by the great majority of the population. General Pétain entered Metz at the head of his troops on November 19, and the formal entry of Marshal Foch into Strasbourg took place on November 25 (Pétain and Castelnau having entered two days earlier). On the 25th also, the famous Statue of Strasbourg, in the Place de la Concorde in Paris, was relieved of the mourning garb which it had worn for so long. The crape and faded wreaths were removed from the statue, and Paris gave herself up to celebrating this symbol of the reunion. On the entry of Marshal Foch into Strasbourg a stirring proclamation was issued to the townsfolk. The opening sentences of this proclamation were as follows:—

"The day of glory has arrived. After forty-eight years of the direst separation, after fifty-one months of war, the sons of great France, our brothers, are united once more. This miracle has been worked by you, people of Strasbourg, and Alsatians, because you kept in your faithful hearts the sacred love of the Mother Country through all the vexations and ill-treatment of the odious yoke—history will hardly furnish another instance of such admirable fidelity. . . ."

At the beginning of December, President Poincaré made an official tour through all the chief towns of Alsace and Lorraine. The President made his official entry into Metz on December 8, and arrived in Strasbourg with full ceremonial on the following day.

The political aspects of the recovery of Alsace-Lorraine must now be mentioned, though, of course, the final decisions upon the points raised could not be taken until the Peace Conference in the following year. The idea of taking a plebiscite of the population in order to ascertain their wishes in regard to

their own destiny, was rejected on all hands in France after the victory of the Allies. It will be remembered that it was only among the Socialists that this plan had found favour even during the weary years of the war. It was therefore taken for granted not only in France but in the countries of France's Allies, that the provinces would be reunited forthwith to the French Republic. The chief difference of opinion which arose related to an entirely different matter. This was the fate, not of Alsace-Lorraine, but of the small though important section of German territory known as the Saar Valley. The Saar Valley was very rich in coal, and many leading French statesmen advocated that this district, in addition to Alsace-Lorraine, should be annexed to France. By the original terms of the armistice the valley had been treated as occupied German territory and not in the same category as Alsace-Lorraine, but before the end of the year it became apparent that the French Government themselves were desirous of annexing this district. It is worth noting here that the French frontiers extended somewhat further to the east before the great Revolution than they did between 1815 and 1870; but the Saar Valley as a whole had never at any time been French, save during the brief period of the Napoleonic Conquest.

A subject which was much discussed during the last few weeks of the year was the method of dealing with the Germans who had immigrated into Alsace-Lorraine during the forty-three years separating the two wars. It was understood that the wealthier and more influential Germans would be expelled, but that the Germans of the working class would be granted the option of remaining in the provinces, but would not be permitted to acquire French citizenship.

After the conclusion of the armistice, the King of Great Britain paid a visit to France, and was received with much enthusiasm and formality in Paris.

President Wilson also paid a visit to France, arriving at Brest on December 13 (see U.S.A.).

Shortly before Christmas the King of Italy paid an official visit to Paris, and on December 19 the President and Madame Poincaré gave a reception at the Elysée in honour of the King and the Prince of Piedmont, who was also present. M. Poincaré made a speech welcoming the monarch to Paris, and referring sympathetically to the completion of Italian unity by the conquest of Trent and Trieste. King Victor Emmanuel, in replying, said that France and Italy had a great and common mission of civilisation to accomplish.

On December 29 long and important speeches were delivered in the Chamber of Deputies by M. Pichon and by M. Clemenceau. M. Pichon said that in regard to the Saar Valley, France had lost territory in 1815, and France could not now forgo her right to urge her necessary claims in the drawing of the frontiers of Alsace-Lorraine. German-Austria, said the Foreign Minister,

must not be allowed to unite with the new German Republic, since such a union would enable Germany to gain in Austria more than she would lose territorially elsewhere. The action of the Allies in Russia had, said the Foreign Minister, been much criticised, but they could not conclude a satisfactory peace with the abominable tyranny now in power there. The Allies were drawing an economic ring round Bolshevism, and they would lend support to the forces fighting against the Moscow Government.

M. Clemenceau's speech dealt with a wide range of policy. There was, he said, a certain difference between the French and the American points of view. France was very near Germany, and had been exposed to invasion. The French Government would continue to rely upon the power of arms, upon the policy of alliances, and upon the old idea of a balance of power; but France was prepared to accept additional guarantees from any League of Nations which might be brought into existence. In regard to the "freedom of the seas," the speaker recounted conversations which he had had with Mr. Lloyd George and President Wilson. France owed a great debt to the British Fleet, and the French Government, declared the Premier, would do nothing which might make it difficult or impossible for the British Navy to render the same assistance again, should the necessity arise.

II. ITALY.

The defeat of the Italian armies in the autumn of 1917 had the effect of still further uniting public opinion in favour of the war. It will be remembered that throughout the conflict there had been considerable difference of opinion in the country on questions of foreign policy, considerably more so than in either Great Britain or France. The Official Socialist Party had throughout taken a strong pacifist line, and the neutralist attitude which they adopted was reinforced from an entirely different quarter by certain clericals and extreme Conservatives who had been opposed to Italy's entry into the war, and when she had entered it, were somewhat luke-warm in support of the national cause. The most important of these neutralists was Signor Giolitti, the ex-Prime Minister and leader of the Conservative Party. Between these two political extremes, however, the majority of the deputies of the Lower House were to be found, and likewise, there is no doubt, a great majority of the Italian nation. After the Italian defeats and the invasion of Venetia by the Austrians many who had been opposed to or indifferent in regard to the war came to the support of the country, and it may be said that the Neutralist Party of the Right, the Conservatives and clericals, ceased to exist as such; and even some of the Official Socialists declared that it was now necessary to support what had become a war of defence. Thus

at the opening of the year Signor Orlando, the Prime Minister, and Baron Sonnino, the Foreign Minister, had a wider support among the people than at any previous stage of the war.

At the end of January Signor Orlando and Signor Crespi (the Minister of Supplies) paid visits to Paris and London. The distinguished Ministers held consultations with leading members of the British Cabinet, and it was understood that important points connected with the political aims of the Entente were discussed. On January 29 an official communication was issued in London stating that the visit of the Italian Prime Minister to England had proved entirely satisfactory, and it was announced that a complete understanding had been established between Great Britain, Italy, and their Allies on all important political, military, naval, and economic matters connected with the prosecution of the war, including some points concerning which some uncertainty and even difference of opinion had previously existed.

On February 12 Signor Orlando delivered a speech in the Lower House dealing in a general manner with the political aims of the kingdom. He began by stating that the professed desire of the Central Powers for peace was disproved by the character of the negotiations then taking place at Brest-Litovsk. There the Germans had been dealing with a party which had adopted the policy of peace at any price, and yet the claims of the Imperialists had been so extreme that even the fanatical Russian pacifists had thought it dishonourable to accept them. The Premier stated that at recent Inter-Allied Conferences the suggestions on the matter of peace made by the German Chancellor and the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister had been examined, but had been found quite unacceptable. The only road to peace, he said, was to continue the war. Italy did not desire war, but she was determined not to forgo either the accomplishment of her national unity or the security of her land and sea-frontiers. "These two aims," declared the Premier, "are well justified and are the complements of each other. Only the full realisation of one and the other will assure to Italy her existence as a really free and independent State. If any doubt could still exist on this point before the war it must by now have been completely dissipated." The Speaker enlarged upon the latter of these two points. He stated that the strategically indefensible character of the Italian land-frontiers had been abundantly proved by the disaster at Caporetto, and this very danger had in fact been foreseen for many years by military and even by non-military writers. The exposed character of the Eastern coast of the Peninsula was scarcely less apparent, since notwithstanding the maritime supremacy of the Entente, Austro-Hungarian warships had been able to bombard Italian ports. The Premier further stated that it was quite unjust to contend that there was any Imperialist tendency in Italian foreign policy. On the contrary, Italy had no desire to dominate other races

and had in fact the greatest sympathy with the peoples still groaning under the oppression of dominating races. Signor Orlando emphasised the point that he wished to destroy the deplorable uncertainty which he said had arisen regarding Italian war aims. In regard to the purely military situation, the Prime Minister said that the Allies had taken full account of the unfortunate situation created by the defection of the new Russian Government, and he said that notwithstanding this disaster the Allies could face the future with equanimity.

This speech was received quietly by the Chamber, the only active hostility coming from the Socialists who occasionally interrupted the Prime Minister during his oration. Some disappointment was, however, expressed that Signor Orlando had failed to enter into greater detail concerning the Italian war aims.

On February 23 a speech was delivered in the Lower House by Baron Sonnino which similarly covered a wide sphere of foreign policy. The Minister commenced by examining the speeches delivered by Count Hertling and Count Czernin on January 24, and he stated that both these statesmen had studiously avoided any positive declarations on territorial questions and their professed agreement with the principles laid down by the American President was of the most general character. Moreover, an extremely cynical commentary upon the professed reasonableness of the German and Austro-Hungarian Governments was provided by the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk where the Germans had given no real opportunity to the border peoples to exercise the right of self-determination. The baron then proceeded to deny that Italy had any Imperialist designs against the neighbouring peoples. She desired nothing save the national unity and the safety of the State thus constituted. In regard to the Eastern Mediterranean also the Speaker said that the Italians had no aggressive designs. They desired only that "an equilibrium of strength should be maintained" since "a certain equilibrium of strength is an essential condition for the sincere constitution and the practical efficacy of the league of nations." The Foreign Minister announced that the Italian Government refused to recognise the peace which had been signed by the "so-called representatives" of Ukrainia and that they had informed the Poles that they could not consider the destiny of Poland decided without the concurrence of the Italian Government. The Minister ended his speech by an appeal for national unity.

After the close of Baron Sonnino's speech, a short oration was delivered by the Prime Minister. He said that the question of food supplies had been occupying the close attention of the Government, and that thanks to the generosity of the Allied Powers the Italian position in relation to food was satisfactory. In reply to the criticisms of the Extreme Left he said that he would never close his eyes to the new ideals. But it was

necessary to fight for these ideals, as President Wilson himself believed.

At the close of the debate a vote of confidence in the Government was carried by 340 votes to 44.

It will be remembered that throughout the war there had notoriously been some conflict of aims between the Italians on the one side, and the Serbs and Jugo-Slav subjects of Austria-Hungary on the other side. At the beginning of April a great attempt was made to smooth away the difficulties dividing not only the Italians and the Jugo-Slavs, but all the numerous races which were under the sway of the Austrians and the Hungarians. To this end a "Conference of the Subject Races of Austria-Hungary" was held in Rome, being opened on April 8. Representatives of the Czecho-Slovaks, the Rumanians, the Jugo-Slavs, and the Poles were present, and Senator Ruffini, representing Italy, was the Chairman of the Conference. French, British (Mr. Wickham Steed), and American representatives also attended the Congress. The aims of the Conference also had the active support of Signor Bissolati, the Reformist Socialist member of the Government. The Conference closed on April 10, and the decisions taken were officially published by the Italian Government. The chief of these decisions were stated to be as follows:—

1. Every race maintains its right to constitute its own nationality and unity as a state, and to complete and achieve an entire independence.

2. Every race recognises in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy an instrument of Germanic domination, and a fundamental obstacle to the realisation of its rights.

3. The Assembly recognises the necessity for a combined struggle for complete liberation against the common oppressors.

These were general resolutions adopted by the whole Congress, but in addition, certain agreements were made between the Italian and Jugo-Slav representatives. In particular it was agreed:

1. That the unity and independence of the Jugo-Slav nation is recognised as of vital interest to the Italian nation; and reciprocally,

2. That the liberation of the Adriatic Sea and its defence against all present and future enemies, is of vital interest for both nations.

3. That territorial controversies shall be settled in a friendly manner on the basis of the principle of nationality, and in such a way, to be defined at the conclusion of peace, as not to injure the vital interests of the two nations.

Whilst they were in Rome, M. Trumbitch (President of the Jugo-Slav Committee), and other Jugo-Slav representatives, were received by Signor Orlando and Signor Bissolati.

At the end of May the Prince of Wales paid an official visit to Rome. On May 25, Prince Colonna, the Mayor of Rome,

gave a reception in the Capitol in honour of the heir to the British throne; and on the following morning the Prince of Wales paid a visit to the Italian Royal Family at the Villa Savoia, just outside Rome.

At the beginning of September an important Congress of the Official Socialist Party was held, and afforded an opportunity for a decision between the policies advocated by the Right Wing and Central Sections of the party (that is, the more moderate Socialists) and the Left Wing or Extremist Section. There had been a tendency latterly on the part of the more moderate Socialists to approach more nearly to the policy of the Italian nation as a whole, and this new movement, which was largely led by a certain Signor Turati, now came up for discussion. The Extremists of course condemned the new movement, and proposed a resolution to that effect. The Right Wing and Central groups also proposed resolutions. In the result the Extremists obtained a very large majority of votes, their resolution being supported by over 14,000 votes, whereas the two other resolutions received only about 2,500 votes each. Thus it will be seen that the Official Socialist Party continued to adhere to the uncompromising pacifist policy which it had always hitherto supported.

The financial position of the Italian Kingdom was deplorable. The revenue for the year ending June 30, 1918, was no less than 260,000,000*l.*, but the expenditure amounted to the stupendous sum of 1,004,000,000*l.* Another war loan, the fourth, was issued in the spring, and the subscriptions to this loan reached the sum of 267,200,000*l.* The loan was thus a much greater success than any of the previous loans, and exceeded the third by over 100,000,000*l.* At the end of 1918 the total indebtedness of the country was about 2,520,000,000*l.*, of which approximately 560,000,000*l.* was owed to Italy's more wealthy Allies. Although the Italian debt was much less than the respective debts of France and Great Britain, it must be remembered that the taxable power of the country was also much less, and that consequently the burden was proportionately heavy. Thus it was calculated that the Italian Government would be called upon to raise 280,000,000*l.* sterling by way of interest on the War Debt; and as the total national income of the country was estimated at only 600,000,000*l.* sterling, it will be seen that the task before the Finance Minister was virtually impossible. The interest which the French Government would have to raise was double that which the Italian Government would be compelled to find, but since the national income of France was more than double that of Italy, the French problem was less difficult proportionately and much less difficult actually. The position of Great Britain was far less serious, as the total national income of that country was at least four times as great as the Italian income. Finally, the position of the United States in regard to this matter really

presented very little difficulty, since the American War Debt was somewhat smaller than that of Italy, and the income of that great country was estimated at no less than ten times that of the Italian nation, *viz.*, 6,000,000,000*l.* sterling per annum.

It was the consideration of these data which caused many Italian statesmen to advocate a pooling of the War Debt between the four great Allied Powers. In particular, this was advocated by that important journal the *Corriere della Sera*. The idea was that each of the four Allies should take over a part of the common War Debt in proportion to its financial ability to bear the strain. The scheme, which was known colloquially as the "Single financial front," was of course calculated to bring great relief not only to Italy, but to France as well.

The defeat of the Austrian offensive in the summer, and still more, of course, the success of the Italian offensive at the end of October caused enthusiastic rejoicings in Rome and throughout Italy. The dramatic change of fortune from the previous autumn naturally caught the imagination of the Italian people. And the excitement reached fever heat when, on November 3, Italian troops arrived in Trent and when (on the same day) Italian forces were landed in Trieste. The reception of the Italian troops in both these historic towns was exceedingly enthusiastic.

On November 20 the Italian Parliament was opened and a newly built hall for the Chamber of Deputies was used for the first time. On this occasion the Prime Minister and the other members of the Government were received with loud applause by the assembled deputies, and the speech which Signor Orlando made in celebration of the victory and in recognition of the assistance of Italy's Allies, was greeted with enthusiasm from all parts of the House, except the Extreme Left.

After the conclusion of the armistice a certain change was noticeable in the Italian attitude on the question of the war aims which Italy ought to pursue. And the comparative amity which had been shown earlier in the year towards the Jugoslavs, gave place to the resuscitation of a certain antagonism which had notoriously existed in the earlier years of the war. As was natural, the disaster at Caporetto had induced Italian politicians and the Italian people to moderate their ideas of Italy's rights. On December 1 a Conference of Nationalist Statesmen, including Signor Boselli, was held in Rome, when speeches were made and resolutions were passed in favour of the annexation to Italy of Fiume, Sebenico, Spalato, and other territories on the eastern shore of the Adriatic. Copies of the resolutions were sent to Signor Orlando, Baron Sonnino, President Wilson, M. Clemenceau, and Mr. Lloyd George, and were taken by a deputation, including Signor Boselli, to Prince Colonna.

The agitation in favour of an annexationist policy along the eastern shore of the Adriatic continued to grow, and the less

balanced newspapers, some of which were supposed to represent Baron Sonnino's views, published heated articles against the Jugo-Slavs. Even that important paper the *Giornale d'Italia* took this line. Although this controversy attracted little attention in England, the matter was followed closely in France, and French public opinion was almost unanimously in favour of the Jugo-Slav claims. The consequence of this was that at the end of the year a polemical discussion was taking place between certain Italian and certain French newspapers; but at the same time the wiser elements in Italy were endeavouring to exert a moderating influence. In addition to territorial questions, a particular grievance of the Italians was that the Jugo-Slavs had obtained possession of the not inconsiderable Habsburg navy.

The Italian journalists were not only inclined to repudiate the so-called Pact of Rome, namely, the semi-official agreement concluded with the Jugo-Slavs in the spring, as described above; they also wished to go beyond the Treaty of London, concluded between Italy and the Entente at the time of the Italian entrance into the war. Thus, the extremists were now claiming Fiume and the whole of Dalmatia. It was not surprising that these claims should have caused resentment among the Jugo-Slavs, as also among the friends of the latter in Paris. All down the Eastern coast of the Adriatic the Italians formed but a very small minority of the population, and there appeared to be no reason why it should be only the strategic interests of Italy, and not those of the Jugo-Slavs, which should be given sympathetic consideration. It was therefore satisfactory that these extreme claims, advocated so vigorously in the Italian Press, should have been discountenanced by some of the chief statesmen, including the Prime Minister himself.

Thus, on December 14 Signor Tittoni delivered a statesman-like and conciliatory speech in the Senate. Signor Tittoni said that the possession of Pola, the Islands, and Avlona, would secure Italy's position in the Adriatic, provided the kingdom could be guaranteed against the possibility of the Straits of Otranto being closed. This could only be guaranteed by the neutralisation of the Corfu Channel. Signor Tittoni condemned the concentration of the nation's attention upon the Dalmatian coast. He said that Italy also had important interests in the Eastern Mediterranean and in Asia Minor, which needed to be considered, and there were also important problems to be decided in regard to Libya, Somaliland, and Eritrea. Signor Tittoni then spoke with approval of the general policy laid down by President Wilson.

Signor Orlando spoke in the Senate on the following day and referred with approval to Signor Tittoni's speech; and he said that the principles enunciated by Dr. Wilson "had freed the war from the dross of particularist points of view and had based it on the purest principles of humanity. . . . Just as we

deprecate violence against ourselves, so shall we use no violence against others."

The moderating influence of the Prime Minister was, however, not sufficiently powerful to stop the agitation in the Press, and even the Cabinet itself appeared to be divided on these all-important questions of foreign policy. The extremists were particularly angered by an alleged discovery that a certain General Mola (who had been head of the Italian Military Mission in London) had been permitted to make serious concessions to the Jugo-Slav point of view after the disaster at Caporetto. Mola was alleged to have renounced the whole of Dalmatia. However this may have been, the friction between the journalistic extremists and the more responsible persons continued; and at the end of the year the question led to a Cabinet crisis. It was announced on December 29 that Signor Bissolati had sent in his resignation. This was significant, because Signor Bissolati was notoriously in favour of making concessions to the Jugo-Slavs. He was followed into retirement by several other members of the Government, and thus at the end of the year these vital questions of foreign policy remained quite undecided.

CHAPTER II.

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

I. GERMANY.

THE events of the year 1918 brought the close of an entire epoch of German history. To realise the importance and significance of the German Revolution which took place in the autumn of that year it is necessary to cast one's mind back over the events of the previous seventy or eighty years. The Congress of Vienna, in following the principle which underlay all its work, had restored something resembling not very distantly the *status quo ante bellum* in Germany. The Germany of 1816 was in most respects the same Germany that had existed before the wars of the French Revolution. The country was still entirely Conservative and almost entirely Monarchic. And although the formal suzerainty of the House of Austria had been destroyed, yet Vienna did in fact still retain a certain acknowledged leadership. The German Confederation was in a real sense the representative in Europe of the Holy Roman Empire, as that Empire had existed in its very last days when it had become almost limited to German territories.

Early in the nineteenth century, however, a strong democratic movement had developed, and many of the leading political thinkers in the country had been intensely dissatisfied with the Monarchic and Conservative conditions. And German Liberals were no less discontented with the division of their country into thirty-nine virtually independent States. At that time ideals

of democracy and the idea of German unity were closely connected with one another, and for the most part the advocates of the one were also the protagonists of the other.

The attempted revolution of the year 1848 was founded upon the union of these two ideals; but the defeat of that movement restored the conditions which had existed in the earlier decades of the century. The year 1848 was therefore a turning-point in German history, for the developments which took place during the succeeding fifteen years led in an entirely different direction from that along which the progressive elements in the country appeared to be carrying the nation before the failure of the revolution.

After 1852, when the monarchic confederation was restored, the epoch began which was to continue until it ended in storm in 1918. It was conceivable that Germany might have progressed along the lines of a monarchic federation with political power distributed much as it was between 1815 and 1848. But, as we know, such was not the actual line of development. Between 1852 and 1871 the disastrous aggrandisement of Prussia took place, with the result that the distribution of political power between the different states and provinces was entirely altered, the full German unity was destroyed—Austria, probably the most enlightened of the German States, being forced out of the federation—and the whole political character and trend of the greater part of Germany, now under the domination of Berlin, was changed fundamentally and greatly for the worse.

It is important for the comprehension of German politics to realise that from 1815 onwards there had been three possible roads along which the nation might have travelled. There was, firstly, a balanced and comparatively enlightened monarchic federation, with Vienna continuing to occupy the most important position—but not a position of domination. It was this policy which had the first chance of success, for the foundations of it were laid by the Congress of Vienna. And its failure must be attributed in the main to the fact that the governing statesmen in the first half of the century proved incapable of uniting monarchic Constitutionalism, with the economic and political progress, which was inevitable in a country like Germany. And this possible type of German polity was, of course, finally destroyed by the unprecedented egotism of the second most important State, Prussia. Then, secondly, there was the ideal of a united democratic Germany, the realisation of which had been attempted in 1848, but which, having once failed, quickly passed out of practical politics. And then, thirdly, there was the development which actually took place after 1870, of an immensely aggrandised Prussia, by means of which that State succeeded in impressing its character upon four-fifths of Germany. The new partial federation became in truth something which could hardly be distinguished from an enlarged Prussia.

It is interesting and important to realise these three possible

courses of development for Germany, because during the years 1917 and 1918 there was in reality an internal struggle proceeding in the country between modern adaptations of all these three ideals. And all three policies were represented by different parties in all the German States during those two years.

When these general conceptions are borne in mind it is possible to see the larger significance of the events which took place both in the German Empire and in Austria during 1918. The Russian Revolution and the subsequent anxiety of the Bolshevik Government to make peace, caused less important reactions in German political conditions than might perhaps have been anticipated. The withdrawal from the Entente of the country which had been deemed at one time—not without reason—the most formidable enemy of Germany, might have been expected to produce a marked heightening of German ambitions and a hardening of the war sentiment. For the relative moderation which had characterised the war policy and the war aims of the majority in the Reichstag and, though less consistently, even of the Imperial Government, had always been due in the main, not to principle or to sincere reasonableness, but to a sense of expediency. The Government and the moderate parties, upon whose support the Government mainly depended, eschewed the wild talk of the pan-Germans and the annexationists; but it would of course be an error to suppose that they had any scrupulous objections to aggrandisement. There is every reason to believe that the majority of the nation would have been ready enough to accept the fruits of victory, if victory could have been attained; but they possessed a certain sense for reality, and accordingly the predominant section of opinion had long regarded the schemes of the extreme chauvinists as mere impracticable dreams. Thus it came about that in a formal manner since the peace offer of December, 1916, and informally even before that event, the German Government and the parliamentary majority had been aiming at a peace which should be concluded on the basis of a compromise with their enemies. The Russian peace did, indeed, strengthen somewhat the position of the extreme war party, but the change was not very marked, and was not sufficient to modify in any fundamental manner the political and parliamentary situation which had existed continuously since the summer of 1915.

This political situation may be briefly summarised. The divisions between the parties formed during the war did not entirely coincide with the party divisions as they existed before the war. On war policy the old parties fell into three larger groups, which may be respectively described as the Chauvinists, the Moderates, and the Internationalists. The Conservatives and the National Liberals formed an extreme Imperialist group, which aimed at a so-called German peace with Annexations, both in the East and in the West. The Central parties in the

Reichstag, together forming a large majority of that House, held to a more moderate policy, and aimed at a peace by compromise which, as described above, was also the official policy of the Imperial Government. These Central Parties consisted of the Catholic Party, the Radicals, and the majority of the Social Democrats. It is possible that the Socialist majority held to this moderate policy from principle, for they had never altogether acquitted the German Government of some responsibility for the war; but in so far as the Clericals and the Radicals were concerned, it is to be feared that their moderation was only grounded in expediency. On the extreme Left of the Reichstag there existed the small party of Internationalists, who consisted merely of the minority of the Socialist Party, led by Herren Haase and Bernstein. This small party had been founded in the summer of 1915 after the great Russian defeats had removed the so-called "Cossack Peril." Although Haase, Bernstein, and their followers held that the Russian despotism had been largely responsible for the war, they were yet fully alive to the aggressive character of the German Government, and they held in particular that even though the German Government might have been justified in their attitude towards Russia and Serbia, yet they had behaved iniquitously in Belgium and towards the Western Powers generally. And the Socialist minority thought that a far more conciliatory policy ought to have been adopted towards Belgium, France, and Great Britain after the summer of 1915, and they had accordingly voted against the War Credits since that time.

The Socialist minority were thus the only real Opposition in the Imperial Parliament. It was they alone who had opposed the war. All the other parties had constantly supported the Government and voted the War Credits, but the distinction between the other two groups, the Chauvinists and the Moderates, ought not to be forgotten, and the difference will be seen to have been of importance as the history of German politics in 1918 comes to be described.

During the year 1917 changes had taken place in the most important appointments in the German Empire. Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg, who had been Chancellor throughout the war, had resigned in July, and had been succeeded for a short period by Herr Michaelis. And then, in the autumn, the chief political post in the empire had been given to the Prime Minister of Bavaria, Count Hertling, who had once been the leader of the Catholic Party in the Reichstag. This appointment was a complete innovation, for previous Chancellors had always been Prussians and Protestants. Count Hertling, as chief adviser to the King of Prussia, was also formally Prime Minister of that kingdom; but a Prussian statesman, Herr Friedberg, was appointed Deputy-Premier, a post which had not existed in the past. A change had also taken place at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Herr Zimmerman, who had been

largely responsible for the disastrous policy which had involved Germany in war with the United States, had resigned; and the post of Foreign Minister was bestowed upon Baron von Kühlmann. The latter statesman had been Councillor of the Embassy in London before the war, and was much abler, though probably no less unscrupulous, than his predecessor. Both Hertling and Kühlmann were closely associated with the moderate foreign policy approved by the majority of the Reichstag. It should be said that this policy had been crystallised in a famous resolution passed by the Lower House on July 19, 1917.

On January 24 Count Hertling delivered a speech to the main committee of the Reichstag, in which he surveyed the whole field of foreign policy, and in particular replied to the Fourteen Points of proposed peace terms, which had recently been laid down by President Wilson. The Chancellor began by referring to the negotiations then proceeding at Brest-Litovsk, and stated that the discussions with the representatives of Ukraina were proceeding very favourably. He then referred to the fact that the Western Powers had refused to participate in the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk; but he passed on to examine Mr. Lloyd George's speech of January 5, and President Wilson's message to Congress of January 6. Mr. Lloyd George, he said, was less offensive in his language than he had previously been; but it was quite a mistake to suppose that the Austro-German Alliance had other than defensive aims. Mr. Lloyd George had, moreover, misrepresented the history of Alsace-Lorraine. Alsace-Lorraine had been historically German territory, and the Treaty of 1871 had in reality merely involved what is now called dis-annexation. The speaker called Thomas Carlyle as witness for this theory, Carlyle having written on this point, "I know of no natural law, and of no Heaven-sent decree, on the strength of which France, alone among the dwellers of the earth, should not be obliged to return a portion of stolen territories, when the owners from whom they were wrested, have a favourable opportunity to get them back."

The Count then passed on to consider Dr. Wilson's speech at much greater length, and he dealt *seriatim* with the President's Fourteen Points.¹

I. No secret international agreements. This point was approved by the Chancellor. II. The freedom of the seas. On this point also the Chancellor said that Germany was in agreement with the United States. III. The question of an economic war. The idea of an economic war, after the war, was also condemned by Count Hertling. IV. Limitation of armaments. The Chancellor said that the German Government were prepared to discuss this matter, which would indeed be of the first importance after the conclusion of hostilities, if only on account of the financial condition of all the European Powers. V. The

¹ See the "United States."

colonial questions. On this point the speaker's remarks were quite non-committal. VI. The evacuation of Russian territory. In regard to this matter the Chancellor declined to admit that the Western Powers had any kind of right to interfere. VII. The question of Belgium. On this point, probably the most important of all, Count Hertling said, "As far as the Belgian question is concerned, it has been declared repeatedly by my predecessors in office that at no time during the war has the forcible annexation of Belgium by the German Empire formed a point in the programme of German policy." But he said the Belgian question would nevertheless have to form part of the general discussion of peace terms, and, in particular, it could not be discussed apart from the principle of the integrity of the territory of the Central Powers. VIII. The evacuation of France. The speaker said that there had never been any intention to annex these parts of France. But he declared again that the Germans would never allow themselves to be robbed of Alsace-Lorraine, and he reminded the house that 87 per cent. of the people of those provinces spoke German as their mother tongue. IX., X., XI. The nationalities of Austria-Hungary and the Balkan questions. Since these questions primarily concerned the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the German Chancellor left the reply to these points to his Austro-Hungarian colleague. XII. The Turkish Empire. Germany, said the Chancellor, would loyally support the just rights of its Turkish ally. XIII. Poland. Since it was the Central Powers which had liberated Poland from Russia, it must be the Central Powers and Poland, herself, which would decide the future of that country. XIV. The League of Nations. The Chancellor expressed general sympathy with this idea.

He then ended his speech by stating once more that the German Government were ready for a peace of reconciliation, but that this peace must be founded upon a recognition of the integrity of the German Empire.

This speech by Count Hertling was well received by the greater part of the German press, but the Pan-German organs regarded the tone of the speech as too conciliatory towards the Entente, and criticised him severely on that ground. The Pan-Germans were still more hostile to the speech delivered on the same day by the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister, Count Czernin.

On January 25 Baron von Kühlmann delivered a speech before the main committee of the Reichstag which covered a wide ground. He began by referring to the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk, and he complained of the obstruction of the Russian delegates to a satisfactory settlement of the question of Russia's western border States. Baron Kühlmann argued that a duly authorised national assembly was equally as competent as, or more competent than, a plebiscite, to exercise the right of self-determination. The speaker then referred to Finland and

to Ukraina and said that the development of affairs in those two countries was proceeding very satisfactorily.

At the end of January severe strikes broke out in many parts of Germany, notably in Hamburg and Munich. These strikes, in which the more extreme Socialists were implicated, may be regarded as almost a premonition of the subsequent revolution. They were not only economic, but to some extent political in character. The authorities, however, acted with promptitude and decision. Thus, the General in command of the Brandenburg district issued a decree dissolving the strikers' council, and martial law was proclaimed in Hamburg, Bremen, and other towns. After this the strike soon collapsed, and this peaceful termination of the disturbances was due also very largely to the action of the Majority Socialists who controlled the Trades Unions and refused strike pay from the Trades Union funds.

At the end of February the Treaty of Peace between Germany and Ukraina duly came up for ratification by Parliament, and on February 20 Baron von Kühlmann delivered a speech on this treaty. The speaker commenced by referring in extremely friendly terms to the Ukrainian people, who, he said, had manifested a sincere desire for peace, and whom he contrasted with the obstructive Bolsheviks of Petrograd. The delimitation of the frontiers of the new State had, he said, presented considerable difficulties. Demarcation of the frontier towards Great Russia had been left over for subsequent negotiations. The frontier towards Poland, which had been drawn in the treaty, had been severely criticised by the Poles, more particularly the inclusion in Ukraina of the district of Kholm. Von Kühlmann said that the German Government had taken this course in regard to Kholm, because if they had not consented to the Ukrainian views on this matter, the entire Treaty of Peace might well have been wrecked. The Foreign Secretary went on to say that he thought that the peace with Ukraina would assist rather than hinder the conclusion of peace with Great Russia.

In the subsequent debate in the Reichstag, the speakers of all parties, except the Independent Socialists, expressed satisfaction with the terms of the treaty. Count Westarp, the Conservative leader, was particularly pleased with the treaty, on the ground that it implied, so he said, the break up of the British blockade of Germany. It was also notable that several deputies spoke in a spirit of hostility towards Poland, and it was clear that German public opinion was very much inclined to favour the Ukrainians at the expense of the Poles.

On February 25 Count Hertling once more made a speech on foreign policy which constituted a reply to the recent declarations of Entente statesmen, and also to the Address to Congress delivered by President Wilson on February 11. Count Hertling opened his speech by saying that he agreed with the English

Liberal politician, Mr. Runciman, in thinking that the Powers would come nearer to a solution if an actual meeting or preliminary conference took place. The Chancellor then proceeded immediately to discuss the essential question of the future of Belgium. And on this point he declared: "It has been repeatedly said from this place that we do not think of retaining Belgium or of making the Belgian State a component part of the German Empire, but that we must, as was also set forth in the Papal Note of August 1, 1917, be safeguarded from the danger that a country with which, after the war, we desire to live again in peace and friendship, should become an object, or jumping off ground of enemy machinations." Count Hertling then said that the means of reaching such a solution could be discussed at such a preliminary conference (as Mr. Runciman had proposed). "If, therefore, a proposal in this direction came from the opposite side, let us say from the Government at Havre, we should not adopt an antagonistic attitude, even though the discussion as a matter of course could not at first be binding."

The Chancellor then went on to say that, desirable though the method of conference might be, it appeared at present to have but little chance of realisation. It was therefore necessary for the speaker to adhere to "the existing method of dialogue across channel and ocean." Count Hertling then dealt at considerable length with the four principles laid down by President Wilson on February 11. So far as the first clause was concerned there could, he said, be no dispute; for who would deny that each part of the peace must be founded in justice. "The phrase coined by the great Father of the church, Augustine, 1,500 years ago, '*Justitia fundamentum regnorum*,' is still valid to-day. Certain it is that only a peace based in all its particulars on the principles of justice has a prospect of endurance."

Count Hertling was also able to adhere unconditionally to President Wilson's second clause, that peoples should not be bartered about as pawns in the game between States, but should have liberty to decide their own destinies. The Chancellor went on to say, however, that President Wilson was under an illusion when he supposed that there existed an essential antagonism between the German sovereigns and the German people. But the speaker expressed agreement with the President's condemnation of the principle of the balance of power, which, he averred, had always been an English device for keeping the Continental Powers in a state of artificial antagonism.

In regard to the third clause, that every territorial settlement must be made, in the first place, in the interests of the populations directly concerned, this caused no antagonism between the Chancellor and the President.

It was necessary, however, for the Chancellor to deal at greater length with President Wilson's fourth principle. This clause stated that all well-defined national aspirations should be

given the utmost satisfaction that might be practicable without introducing new antagonisms. The Chancellor said that he could assent to this in principle, but he must add the qualification that the idea must be accepted by all States and all nations. He then went on to say that President Wilson appeared to have jumped ahead of the existing conditions of the world. The President had stated that the German Chancellor was speaking to a Court of the entire world. But Count Hertling said that he must decline to accept this Court, on the ground that it was prejudiced. At the present time no generally accepted Court of Arbitration existed, and there was no League of Nations, but Count Hertling would joyfully accept such a Court if it could be brought into existence and if it were impartial.

The speaker then went on to say that there was no trace of the acceptance of this principle by the British Government which was thoroughly imperialist, and "when England talks about a people's right of self-determination, she does not think of applying the principle to Ireland, Egypt, or India."

The speaker then proceeded to discuss other matters, and said that the recent advances in the East, though they might be aggressive in action, were defensive in principle, and the advances into Ukraina and into the other border States had been necessitated by the invasion of those territories by the barbarous Red Guards. After a reference to Rumania, Count Hertling dealt briefly with the question of Poland, and said that he hoped that the acute controversy which had recently arisen between Ukraina and Poland, in regard to the drawing of the frontiers between those States, would be settled by a compromise. So far as Germany was concerned, only such concessions (from Poland) would be demanded as were essential for military reasons. The Chancellor then referred once more to the question of Alsace-Lorraine. The Entente had, he said, pursued aims of conquest from the first, and were fighting for the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France. "I have nothing to add to what I have already said on this subject. There is no Alsace-Lorraine question in an international sense. If there be such a question, it is a purely German question."

The remainder of the speech dealt with less essential matters.

On March 18, when the Reichstag was debating the first reading of the Peace Treaty with Russia (see "The European War," p. 12), Count Hertling again made a long speech of general interest. The speaker briefly outlined the course of the negotiations and explained that peace had finally been concluded at Brest-Litovsk on March 3, and had been ratified by a "competent assembly at Moscow on March 16." Germany, said the Chancellor, had now no desire to oppose the justifiable endeavours and aims of the Russia which had been liberated from Tzarism, and Germans could only regret that at the present moment conditions in many parts of Russia were so truly terrible. In regard to the Treaty itself, the terms contained no

reference to oppressive war indemnities and no seizures of Russian territory. What had happened was that certain border peoples had severed their connexion with the Russian Empire. In the case of Courland, the process of self-determination had gone furthest, and a deputation of the newly established Courland Diet had formally asked for political connexion with the German Empire. In respect of Lithuania, also, a military and economic connexion with Germany was contemplated, even though the political tie might not be so close as in the case of Courland. Livonia and Esthonia were, however, in a different category, since they were situated east of the line drawn in the Peace Treaty; but in the existing disturbed conditions they were being policed by the German Empire. Count Hertling then stated that the future status of Poland was still a subject of negotiation between the Polish authorities on the one hand, and Germany and Austria-Hungary on the other. When these treaties had been sanctioned by Parliament, said the speaker, and when peace had been concluded with Rumania, then at last peace would have been restored on the entire Eastern Front. But, he said, let there be no delusions; for among the Western Powers no inclination for peace could be discerned. They appeared to be determined to fight on until Germany was destroyed. The Germans, however, would not lose courage and were prepared for further heavy sacrifices. The German Government had confidence in their just cause and in the steadfast German nation. "The responsibility, however, for further bloodshed will fall on the heads of all those who desire the continuance of that bloodshed."

The termination of the speech was greeted with loud applause from all parts of the House, except from the Extreme Left.

A long speech was then made by Baron von dem Bussche, the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, who said that in the revised terms, as laid down at the beginning of March, the only important modification was the clause relating to Kars, Ardahan, and Batum. The Minister then said that it had also been necessary to negotiate a Treaty of Peace with Finland, because, although the Finnish people had never been actuated by any hostility towards Germany, Finland having been part of the Russian Empire, the Grand Duchy had been technically at war with the Central Powers. These negotiations had taken place in Berlin, and had been of the most amicable and satisfactory character.

After the conclusion of Baron von dem Bussche's speech the debate became general, and it was soon clear that the Brest-Litovsk treaty was welcomed by all parties except the Socialists. The sentiment of the House was, however, rather more Liberal than that of the Government, and speakers of the Centre Party and of the Radical Party (notably Herr Naumann) criticised some of the provisions in regard to the border peoples, especially

the alleged right of the existing Diet of Courland to speak for the people of that country. It was averred that the diet in question represented only the German-speaking aristocracy of the territory, and in no sense voiced the wishes of the Lettish commonalty. The Socialists were of course still more critical of these provisions of the treaty.

The financial position of the German Empire at the opening of the year was such as to cause all thinking Germans almost to despair. The pre-war debt of the Empire had amounted to only 240,000,000*l.*, but the several States possessed individual debts which together reached the sum of 800,000,000*l.* Thus, the real aggregate indebtedness of the federation amounted to over one milliard sterling before the war. The War Credits voted by Parliament up to the end of 1917 reached the total of 5,450,000,000*l.* This sum was, however, by no means covered by the subscriptions to the seven great War Loans which the Imperial Government had issued. The total subscriptions to these seven Loans amounted to about 3,650,000,000*l.* And since practically no part of the war expenditure had been met by taxation, the funds actually subscribed towards the cost of the war thus fell short of the expenditure by a sum of about 1,800,000,000*l.* sterling. At the beginning of March further credits to the amount of 750,000,000*l.* sterling were authorised by the Reichstag. And in March subscriptions were opened for the Eighth German War Loan, which consisted of 5 per cent. obligations and 4½ per cent. treasury bonds, both being issued at the price of 98. The Loan was opened for subscriptions from March 18 to April 18, and at the end of April it was announced that the aggregate subscriptions had reached the very large sum of 738,000,000*l.* sterling, which total was higher even than that of the Sixth Loan, which had previously been the largest of any Loan issued by the German Government. It is possible that this high figure was reached owing to the enthusiasm caused by the recent German victories in the West.

Apart from the War Credits and the War Loans, the ordinary receipts and expenditure of the German Empire were greatly swollen. Thus the receipts and expenditure for 1917 were balanced at 247,000,000*l.* sterling, and the estimated receipts and expenditure for the financial year 1918 were no less than 366,600,000*l.* The increase shown here was due mainly to the necessary increase in the interest due on the National Debt. There were also to be certain Imperial Extraordinary Receipts amounting to about 5,400,000*l.* and Extraordinary Expenditure of about 21,300,000*l.*

In the spring much excitement was caused in Germany as well as in England by the publication of Prince Lichnowsky's memoir dealing with the period when he was Ambassador in London. The ex-Ambassador, than whom no better witness to the course of diplomatic events in London immediately prior to the outbreak of war can be imagined, wrote a most able defence

of Sir Edward Grey's course of action; and his testimony entirely exploded the absurd myth that the British Government had been deliberately working for war. The somewhat anti-Austrian tone of the Prince's pamphlet, and the absence from his argument of the usual German contention that there existed a peril from Russia caused great resentment in Germany. An official reply was issued by Herr von Jagow, who was Foreign Minister from 1913 until the end of 1916. Von Jagow's reply was a long statement rebutting the charge that the German Government had been working for war, and contending, on the contrary, that that Government, particularly during the period when he himself was at the Foreign Office, had aimed at an understanding with Great Britain, but without breaking away from Germany's chief ally, Austria-Hungary. Von Jagow, indeed, made a quotation from Professor Oncken that the aim of Germany before the war was quite rightly to achieve a "moral extension of the Triple Alliance over the Channel."

On June 24 Baron von Kühlmann delivered a long and general speech in the Reichstag which caused a considerable sensation in the country and led immediately to his own resignation from the Foreign Office. At the opening of his speech the Baron referred in laudatory language to Count Czernin, and said that that statesman's resignation from the Foreign Office was due to affairs which were exclusively the concern of Austria-Hungary. Kühlmann said that the recent meeting between the two Kaisers was of much significance; and that not only were both States loyal to the existing alliance but that it was proposed to strengthen and deepen the bond politically, militarily, and economically. Negotiations on the matter were taking place between Baron Burian and himself and were proceeding satisfactorily. The Foreign Minister referred sympathetically to Bulgaria and Turkey. The speaker then described at great length the position in what had been the Russian Empire. He said that a whole series of States were being formed out of the huge body of the extinct empire. With the assistance of a German contingent the Finnish Government troops had cleared Finland of the Red Guards. In regard to the Baltic provinces the diplomatic line drawn at Brest-Litovsk had, he said, caused an artificial schism in what was essentially a single region. It was painful for the Lettish population to be cut up, but at the time it was necessary for Germany to conclude peace on some such terms as those that had been ratified. At the urgent request of all the respectable elements in Esthonia and Livonia the German Government had sent troops into those provinces to protect the people from the Red Guards. On the question of Poland, von Kühlmann said nothing new. In the Caucasus, said von Kühlmann, three new States had come into existence, namely, Georgia, a semi-independent Armenia, and a Tartar State. Of these the most important and most stable was Georgia. Germany had entered into friendly relations with this State and had sent a diplomatic mission to Tiflis.

After referring politely to the neutral States, von Kühlmann dealt with the military situation. He said that the initiative still remained with the German generals, but he then proceeded to quote a warning uttered as long ago as 1890 by Field-Marshal von Moltke, that a great European war was likely to be of long duration. Notwithstanding the German successes, there was, he said, no inclination for peace to be observed among the enemy. A few days before, Mr. Balfour had repeated the old legend that Germany had unchained the war in order to achieve world domination. No intelligent man in Germany had ever entertained the hope that Germany would attain to world domination. The idea of world domination in Europe was Utopian; Napoleon's example had shown that. Then von Kühlmann proceeded: "I believe one can say, without fear of being contradicted by the result of further revelations and investigations, that the deeper we penetrate into the antecedents of the war the clearer it becomes that the Power which planned and desired the war was Russia," and that France and Great Britain played subsidiary but maleficent rôles in supporting the Russian desire for war. It was in this direction that the guilt for the war was to be found. The speaker then said that the German Government could not discuss the question of peace unless the absolute integrity of the territory of the German Empire and its allies was granted at the outset. In regard to Belgium, the German Government could not give any pledge which would bind them without binding their opponents. Nevertheless, the German Government were still disposed for peace; and, indeed, he regarded it as absolutely essential and certain that an exchange of views should take place sooner or later. "Without such an exchange of ideas, in view of the enormous magnitude of this coalition-war, in view of the number of Powers, including those from overseas, involved in it, an absolute end can hardly be expected to appear in military decisions alone, without any diplomatic negotiations. . . . We hope that our enemies perceive that against the resources at our disposal the idea of a victory for the Entente is a dream and an illusion, and that they will, in due course, as Mr. Asquith expects from us, find a way to approach us with peace offers which correspond to the situation and satisfy German vital aims."

This speech caused an immense sensation in Germany and was deeply resented by the Conservatives and the chauvinists. In particular, exception was taken to the passage concerning the improbability of a military victory for either side. The speech was condemned in the Reichstag by Count Westarp, the Conservative leader, and by Herr Stresemann, speaking for the National Liberals. The dissatisfaction was so great that it occasioned no surprise when on July 9 it was announced that Baron von Kühlmann had resigned.

The resignation of this able, if unscrupulous, statesman, was

rightly accounted a victory for the chauvinists. This became immediately apparent when it was announced that Kühlmann's successor at the Foreign Office would be Admiral von Hintze, who was notoriously favoured by the Conservative Party. At the time of his appointment to this important position, von Hintze was Ambassador at Christiania.

The political situation in Germany underwent a striking change in the next three months. This development was due to the dawning consciousness in all circles of the nation that a German victory was quite impossible and that a decisive German defeat was a contingency which must be seriously considered. The chief cause of the growing pessimism was not the victories of Marshal Foch's armies, though these no doubt had an important effect. The main cause of the failure of the German spirit was the fact that no serious relief from the privations and conditions of semi-starvation had been obtained through the peace in the East. The truth was, of course, that the peoples of Eastern Europe were themselves starving, and consequently the most ruthless exactions of the Germans had produced very little serious relief. The entrance of the United States into the war had caused an actual stiffening of the blockade in the sense that whereas previously American citizens had been free to send as much food to the northern neutrals as might escape the vigilance of the British Fleet, they were now forbidden by the American Government itself to send more than quite small and strictly limited quantities to those countries. The American Government had cut off the export of fodder to the Teutonic neutrals, which had necessitated the slaughter of swine and cattle in Northern Europe, particularly in Denmark. Thus 75 per cent. of the hogs in Denmark had been killed off, and it is indicative of the privations prevailing in Germany that whereas the supplies of meat per person in France and Great Britain in the earlier part of the summer amounted to about 25 to 30 oz. weekly, in Germany each person secured only 5 oz. In the twelve months from March, 1917, to March, 1918, the number of pigs in the German Empire was reduced from 13,000,000 to under 6,000,000; and the number of cattle was also reduced. Furthermore, the supplies of bread, bad though the quality was, were also quite inadequate. Up to May each person had received nearly 4 lb. of bread per week, but in that month the weekly ration was reduced to 2½ lb. The number of eggs allowed to each person varied in different parts of Germany, from one a month to two a week, but in most towns did not exceed one a week. Some of the less essential foods, notably sugar and jam, were as plentiful as in France and Great Britain; and there was no very serious scarcity of potatoes, the potato-ration rising in some places to 9 lb. per week, and nowhere falling much below 3 lb.

These conditions did not amount to actual starvation, but they did constitute a state of universal semi-starvation and severe

privation, which, prolonged as it was over a period of many months, had a serious effect upon the health of the people, and depressed their spirits, and influenced their very character. The effects of this prolonged course of under nourishment need to be borne in mind when considering the sudden, complete, and dramatic collapse of the resistance of the German nation as a whole in the autumn; for these effects were undoubtedly among the most important factors which led to the sudden victory of the Entente.

During the session of the Reichstag held in July, the Government brought in a Bill authorising further war credits of 750,000,000*l.* sterling, and on July 12 this Bill was approved by the House. All parties in the House, except the Independent Socialists and the Polish Nationalists, voted for the Credits. The Independent Socialists voted against the Bill.

The period from the beginning of July to the end of September may be described as the last attempt of the Prussian Imperialists to hold their position in Germany and in Europe. On September 24 long speeches were delivered to the Main Committee of the Reichstag by Count Hertling, Admiral von Hintze and Herr von Payer (the Vice-Chancellor). Count Hertling referred at the outset to the discontent in the country which had now become widespread, owing, he said, to the sufferings and deprivations which the people had been obliged to undergo during the last four years. The Chancellor then referred at great length to the course of the war and to the diplomatic situation. He complained that, although he had expressed such a large measure of agreement with President Wilson in his speech on February 25, yet Dr. Wilson had appeared unwilling to continue the discussion, which ought to have been fruitful in results. The speech delivered by the Foreign Minister was somewhat more interesting. He dealt at length with the position in Muscovy and Ukrainia, saying that the position in the latter country was becoming more satisfactory. The Foreign Minister then proceeded to deal with the various newly constituted Eastern States, and in particular spoke with approval of the proposal to establish a Finnish monarchy. In conclusion he referred to the German-Spanish dispute, and said that the German Government would agree to hand over German ships in compensation for Spanish ships sunk outside the barred zone, but not for those sunk within the zone. Von Payer's speech also dealt with the East, and he said that Germany would brook no interference in the Eastern settlement.

As already stated, the few months which succeeded the fall of von Kühlmann may be regarded as the last attempt of Prussianism to maintain its place in Germany and in Europe. At the end of September, however, the Emperor and the leaders in Berlin seem to have realised that the attainment of their objects was now quite impossible. Then there followed a brief attempt to liberalise the Hohenzollern monarchy and to

alter fundamentally the character which the new German Empire had displayed to the world from its foundation onwards. This attempt, which lasted through October, may be compared to the very much longer Liberal period through which Austria whilst Count Czernin was Foreign Minister.

On September 30 it was announced that both Count Hertling and Admiral von Hintze had resigned their appointments, and it was also announced that the Emperor would grant increased powers to Parliament. It was seen at once that the Emperor was now searching for more Liberal advisers; and a few days later it was announced that Prince Maximilian of Baden had been appointed Imperial Chancellor. Prince Maximilian, who was fifty-one years of age, was a cousin of the Grand Duke of Baden, and was heir to the throne of that State. Prince Maximilian was known throughout Germany for his Liberal views, to which he had given expression on more than one occasion during the war. His utterances on the principles of democracy were not always very consistent, but, at the worst, he was far less reactionary than any other statesman who had been Chancellor of the new German Empire.

Prince Maximilian was destined by fate to deal with the results of the gross mistakes committed by his immediate predecessors; and as we shall see, it was he who guided his country through the fateful time of the negotiations for an armistice, though after the fall of the monarchy he was obliged to give place to more Radical politicians. The Prince was Chancellor, therefore, for only about six weeks.

The new German Imperial Cabinet formed at the beginning of October under the presidency of Prince Maximilian, included politicians of a type quite new in German Governments; thus, the well-known Liberal member of the Centre Party, Herr Erzberger, and Herr Scheidemann, the leader of the Socialist Majority, were appointed Secretaries of State without portfolios. And Herr David, also a Socialist, was appointed Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Dr. Solf, who had long been Colonial Secretary, now became also Foreign Secretary.

The first act of this new Government was to issue a Note to President Wilson through the Swiss Government asking for the opening of peace negotiations. The text of this Note, which was published on October 6, was as follows:—

“The German Government requests the President of the United States of America to take in hand the restoration of peace, acquaint all belligerent states with this request, and invite them to send plenipotentiaries for the purpose of opening negotiations. It accepts the programme set forth by the President of the United States in his Message to Congress of January 8, 1918, and in his later pronouncements, especially his speech of September 27, as a basis for peace negotiations.

“With a view to avoiding further bloodshed the German Government requests the immediate conclusion of an armistice

on land and water and in the air. (Signed) Max, Prince of Baden, Imperial Chancellor."

On October 5 the new Chancellor gave an address to the Reichstag, in which he announced the despatch of this Note asking for an armistice. The speech was of considerable length. At the outset Prince Max said that the Reichstag would now assume a more important position in the governance of the Empire. In accordance with this principle, the programme of the Reichstag majority, including the famous peace resolution of July 19, 1917, had been now adopted by the Government. The Government were also desirous of joining a general League of Nations. The Belgian question ought to be solved by the complete restoration of Belgium, in her independence and in her territorial integrity. Furthermore, the peace treaties already concluded in the East would not be allowed to become obstacles to a general peace. After dealing with domestic affairs, including the enhancement of the powers of the Reichstag, the democratisation of the Prussian franchise, and labour legislation, the Chancellor went on to deal with the question of peace. After stating that they all had confidence in the German Army, he said that after consultation with Germany's allies a Note had been sent to Washington proposing an armistice (the Note quoted above). The Chancellor concluded his speech by saying that he hoped peace would be secured, but that if Germany's enemies were still intent upon her destruction he would still see no cause to despair.

As stated elsewhere (see the United States), the German Government's Note received a prompt answer from Washington in the shape of certain questions regarding the reality of the German acceptance of President Wilson's terms. The next German Note, which was sent as early as October 12, was as follows:—

"In reply to the questions of the President of the United States of America, the German Government hereby declares:—

"The German Government has accepted the terms laid down by President Wilson in his Address of January 8 and in his subsequent addresses as the foundation of a permanent peace of justice. Consequently its object in entering into discussions would be only to agree upon practical details of the application of these terms.

"The German Government believes that the Governments of the Powers associated with the Government of the United States also adopt the position taken by President Wilson in his Address.

"The German Government, in agreement with the Austro-Hungarian Government, for the purpose of bringing about an armistice, declares itself ready to comply with the propositions of the President in regard to evacuation. The German Government suggests that the President may occasion the meeting of a mixed commission, for making the necessary arrangements concerning the evacuation,

"The present German Government which has undertaken the responsibility for this step towards peace has been formed by conferences and in agreement with the great majority of the Reichstag. The Chancellor, supported in all of his actions by the will of this majority, speaks in the name of the German Government and of the German people. (Signed) Solf, State Secretary of Foreign Office, Berlin, October 12, 1918."

Immediately after the receipt of the second German Note, a reply was dispatched by the American Government (see U.S.A.). After some delay a third German Note, of greater length, was duly sent. The text of this was as follows:—

"In complying with the proposal to evacuate occupied territories the German Government started from the standpoint that the procedure in this evacuation and the conditions of armistice are to be left to the judgment of military advisers, and that the present relative strength on the fronts must be made the basis of arrangements that will safeguard and guarantee it. The German Government leaves it to the President to create an opportunity to settle the details. It trusts that the President of the United States will approve no demand that would be irreconcilable with the honour of the German people and with paving the way to a peace of justice.

"The German Government protests against the charge of illegal and inhuman practices that is made against the German land and sea forces, and thereby against the German people. Destructions (*Zerstörungen*) will ever be necessary to cover a retreat, and are in so far permitted under international law. The German troops have the strictest instructions to respect private property and to care for the population according to their ability. Where, notwithstanding this, excesses occur, the guilty are punished.

"The German Government also denies that in sinking ships the German Navy has purposely destroyed lifeboats together with their occupants. The German Government suggests that in all these points the facts shall be cleared up by neutral commissions.

"In order to avoid everything that might render peace work more difficult, orders have, at the direction of the German Government, been sent out to all U-boat commanders that will exclude the torpedoing of passenger ships. However, for technical reasons, no guarantee can be undertaken that this order will reach every submarine at sea before its return.

"President Wilson describes as a fundamental condition for peace the removal of every arbitrary power that can separately, uncontrolled, and of its own single choice disturb the peace of the world. To this the German Government replies: Hitherto the Parliament of the German Empire has had no influence on the formation of the Government. The Constitution did not provide for the co-operation of Parliament in decisions on war and peace. A fundamental change has come about in this state

of affairs. A new Government has been formed in complete accord with the desires of a Parliament that has arisen from equal, general, secret, and direct suffrage. The leaders of the great parties of the Reichstag are amongst its members.

"In the future, too, no Government can enter upon or carry on its office without possessing the confidence of the majority of the Reichstag. The responsibility of the Imperial Chancellor towards Parliament is being legally extended and safeguarded. The first act of the new Government was to submit a Bill to the Reichstag so amending the Constitution of the Empire that the approval of Parliament is requisite for a decision on war and peace. A guarantee for the duration of the new system, however, does not rest only in legal guarantees, but also in the unshakable will of the German people, the great majority of whom are behind these reforms, and demand energetic persistence in prosecuting them.

"The President's question as to with whom he and the Governments associated against Germany are dealing is therefore clearly and unequivocally answered, to the effect that the peace and armistice offer issues from a Government which is free from all arbitrariness and irresponsible influence, and is supported by the approval of the overwhelming majority of the German people. Berlin, October 20.

"(Signed) Solf, Secretary of State of the Foreign Ministry."

On October 22 Prince Max delivered in the Reichstag the longest of the speeches which he made whilst he was Chancellor. In this speech the Prince dealt first with the negotiations then proceeding between the American and the German Governments on the question of peace. He said that he hoped that President Wilson would make it more clear than he had hitherto done that the acceptance of the famous Fourteen Points would not be contrary to the vital interests of the German people. But, he said, the German people must realise that in future they would not be able to hold fast to the national egotism which had characterised them too much in the past. The significance of this terrible war was, before all things, a victory for the idea of justice. The speaker then turned to domestic affairs. He said that equal, direct, and secret suffrage had now been secured for Prussia through the concessions made by the more Conservative parties. It was also hoped by means of one of the new Bills just introduced into the Reichstag, to bring that House into closer touch with governmental affairs by means of establishing a special committee which would co-operate with the Imperial Chancellor. Further, Parliamentary Government had already been introduced into Alsace-Lorraine. It was, furthermore, the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill into the Reichstag for the purpose of altering Article XI. of the Imperial Constitution. The Bill which was contemplated would bring about nothing less than the parliamentarisation of the German State; for the Bill would provide

that the Reichstag would be jointly responsible with the monarch and the Government for decisions on the vital questions of war and peace. It was also the intention of the Government to extend greater liberties to the people in the way of public meetings and the freedom of the press. The Prince said that the German people had already gained further liberties in the last few weeks, though it must not be forgotten that in such questions as municipal government and the Reichstag franchise the German people enjoyed advantages which had long been the envy of the world. The people had attained further liberties, but they must beware lest in order to meet foreign criticism they adopted forms of government in which they did not sincerely believe. The Chancellor ended his speech by referring in eulogistic terms to the defence which the German Army was making against greatly superior numbers.

The chief point of historic interest in this speech was the reference to the new Bill for altering Clause XI. of the German Constitution. This was interesting as showing the death-bed attempt to parliamentarise the German Empire. According to the new Bill the amended Clause XI. would read as follows:—

“The Presidency of the Federation belongs to the King of Prussia who bears the name of German Emperor. The Emperor has to represent the Empire internationally, to declare war and to conclude peace in the name of the Empire, to enter into alliances and other treaties with Foreign Powers, to accredit and to receive Ambassadors.

“The consent of the Federal Council and of the Reichstag is necessary for the declaration of war in the name of the Empire, unless an attack on the territory or the coast of the confederation has taken place.

“Peace Treaties and those treaties with foreign States which concern subjects of Imperial legislation, require the consent of the Federal Council and of the Reichstag.”

The first paragraph of this clause was left unchanged, but the two following paragraphs were worded differently in order to increase the powers and responsibility of the Reichstag. The modifications thus proposed were not really fundamental, however, since the qualification relating to an attack upon the confederation would have left the sovereign, in practice, with a wide discretion in regard to the declaration of war.

In reply to the third German Note, President Wilson stated that he was prepared to propose an armistice to the Powers associated with him (see United States). On October 28 the German Government sent a short reply to this last American Note. The reply was as follows:—

“The German Government has taken cognisance of the reply of the President of the United States. The President is aware of the profound changes which are taking place in German constitutional life. The peace negotiations will be conducted by a People's Government in whose hands the

decisive powers actually and constitutionally rest. The military authorities are also subordinate to it. The German Government now awaits the proposals for an armistice, which is the prelude to a peace of justice such as President Wilson has characterised in his declaration.

“(Signed) Solf, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.”

After the exchange of these notes, the negotiations for an armistice were quickly opened, Herr Erzberger being the head of the German delegation which went to the Western Front to sue for an armistice from Marshal Foch and Admiral Wemyss.¹ Whilst the final armistice negotiations were taking place, and before they were completed, a revolution took place in Germany. Prince Max's Government at the end felt even more strongly than at first the influence of the democratic wave, and at the end of October the Government brought in still more drastic proposals for the modification of the German Constitution. They proposed that any declaration of war, not excluding a declaration due to an attack upon the territory or coast of the Empire, should require the consent both of the Bundesrat and of the Reichstag. But these reforms, important though they were, were not sufficient to allay the spirit then abroad in Germany. The end came quickly to the belated attempt to convert Prussia-Germany into a truly constitutional monarchy—to the attempt to bring Prussia into line with the policy of Count Czernin, to revive and to extend to Prussia the pre-Bismarckian monarchic tradition. At the last the only opposition to the reforms came from the Conservative Party in the Reichstag, led by Count Westarp. The Conservative leader voiced this opposition in the Reichstag, speaking with considerable eloquence and not without a certain dignity. Count Westarp said that these reforms were in truth concessions to foreign opinion. Prussia, he said, ought not to allow herself to be influenced in her domestic policy by the opinions of foreigners. If it were necessary to face defeat, the defence should be kept up to the last, for so, and so only, could the spirit of the German people be kept alive after defeat; but if concessions were made to the opinions of Germany's enemies with a view to inducing them to be more lenient, then all the spirit and the self-respect of the German nation would be destroyed. The Conservative Party, said the speaker, would oppose this course to the last. Such views were not, however, those of the parliamentary majority, and were not even supported by the National Liberals. The proposed reforms, however, as already stated, were not sufficiently fundamental to meet the disgust then felt against the ruling House by the mass of the German people.

At the beginning of November, therefore, there was a sudden outbreak of a republican movement occurring spontaneously in many parts of the country—a sudden revival of the old spirit of

¹ An account of the armistice negotiations is given in “The War,” Chapter III., and the terms of the armistice are given in full in “Public Documents.”

1848. The first outbreaks occurred in the Fleet and at the ports ; more particularly at Kiel, on Sunday, November 3. It was alleged that the mutiny in the fleet was finally occasioned by orders given from Berlin that the whole High Seas Fleet should go out into the North Sea and join battle with the British. But the report, though not perhaps intrinsically improbable, was afterwards denied. However this may have been, certain it is that in Germany (as previously in Russia) the most violent revolutionaries were to be found among the seamen of the Imperial Navy. During the first week of November it was openly advocated in many quarters in Germany that the Emperor should abdicate. The Kaiser himself seems to have resisted these proposals when they were first made, though it was apparent to every onlooker that he and his House would not survive the disastrous termination of the war. Every day brought reports of new outbreaks in different parts of the country, and in Hamburg there was some conflict between the police and the revolutionaries. In nearly all large towns "Councils of Workmen's and Soldier Delegates," or Soviets, after the Russian pattern, were formed. On November 7 Herr Scheidemann, speaking for the Majority Socialists, who had hitherto, it will be remembered, formed a part of Prince Max's Government, demanded that the Kaiser and the Crown Prince should abdicate by noon of the next day. Prince Henry of Prussia (the Emperor's brother) was forced to flee from the revolutionaries in Kiel. The extreme revolutionaries, Herr Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, now set at liberty, started a violent Bolshevik agitation. On November 8 Prince Max of Baden resigned the Chancellorship.

In the meantime a revolution was carried through in Bavaria. The movement was then led by Herr Kurt Eisner, one of the best-known Socialist writers in Germany. Mass meetings were held in Munich on November 7, and so general was the sympathy with the revolution that a republic was proclaimed with but little disturbance in the city. A Government was formed under the presidency of Kurt Eisner, and in general sympathy with the Independent Socialists of Berlin.

The final developments in Berlin were also almost bloodless. On November 7 General von Linsingen, Commander-in-Chief in Brandenburg, issued a proclamation closing communication between Berlin and the country outside. All trains to and from the capital were stopped, and telegraphic and telephonic communication was also broken off. A large number of troops were also drafted into the metropolis. Whilst these events were taking place, however, the Emperor himself was not in his Capital, but was at Main Headquarters in Belgium. There were no conflicts between the troops and the populace in Berlin. The ultimatum to the Kaiser issued by Scheidemann, containing, as it did, a threat to resign, finally induced the unsuccessful monarch to submit to the inevitable. And at about noon on

Saturday, November 9, special editions of the *Berliner Tageblatt* and the *Morgenpost* appeared with the announcement that the Emperor William II. had abdicated. There was immediately great excitement in the streets, the change being accepted as readily by the soldiers as by the civilian crowds. Armed motor-cars rushed through the streets and compelled the soldiers to remove the cockades from their caps, these cockades being the emblem of allegiance to the Kaiser. The newly-formed Berlin Soviet established itself in the offices of the newspaper *Vorwärts*. During Saturday and Sunday the excitement and even enthusiasm for the new régime continued, but on Monday 11, with the publication of the terms of the armistice, the excitement largely evaporated and was succeeded by a general depression and a realisation of the terrible consequences of defeat. In the evening of November 9 Herr Ebert, one of the Majority Socialist leaders, and Chairman of the Main Committee of the Reichstag, succeeded Prince Max as Chancellor of Germany and Premier of Prussia. Five other Socialists, Scheidemann, Landsberg (both Majority Socialists), Haase, Dittmann, and Barth (these three being Independent Socialists), were associated with Ebert to form a Supreme Council; but a large German Ministry was maintained, and included various non-Socialist members of the Reichstag Majority, notably Dr. Solf at the Foreign Office.

Herr Ebert's administration had to be regarded from the first as the Central German Government, and it did in fact wield fairly effective jurisdiction not only over all Prussia (except, of course, the occupied territory west of the Rhine) but over all the States except Bavaria. In the latter State Herr Eisner acted almost independently from the first, and indeed the association between Munich and Berlin was now in the nature of an inheritance from the Hohenzollern régime rather than a living reality. It will be noticed that the Independent Socialists had now associated themselves with the Berlin Government, and they were in truth given more influence than their strength in the country really seemed to warrant. Of the Independent Socialist leaders, one of the most enlightened was Herr Haase, a politician who had not hesitated to adopt a very independent attitude during the war, and who had condemned the German treatment of Belgium. Herr Haase and the Minority Party must not be confounded with the party of Liebknecht, the latter being a violent unbalanced agitator who had been imprisoned for the greater part of the war. Liebknecht had, in earlier days, condemned the Kaiser's policy with great boldness, but as a constructive politician he was ridiculed and disliked by moderate men of all parties. Liebknecht now set himself at the head of the Extreme or "Spartacus" section of the Socialists. Rosa Luxemburg was associated with him. The Spartacus Group was more extreme than the Minority Socialists, and may be correctly compared with the Bolsheviks of Russia.

Whilst the unfortunate politicians in Berlin were struggling to make the best of an almost hopeless situation, the Emperor William was playing an incredibly ignominious part. It is difficult to imagine anything more utterly contemptible than the end of the reign of the boastful War Lord of the most powerful nation in Europe. Nobody would have expected from the Emperor William II. any sense of duty towards humanity, but some might have supposed that he would display some touch of sincere sentiment towards that German people whom he had misruled so terribly, or some faint idea of military honour. Yet, when the end came, when the last losing battles were being fought, the War Lord did not elect to share the dangers which surrounded his troops, so many millions of whom he had sent into the infernal tortures of modern war. The Emperor was not in Berlin at the revolution. He was not in the danger zone when his troops were making their last efforts. William II. fled across the frontier into Holland on November 10 and took up a safe abode at the castle of his friend, Count Bentinck, at Amerongen, in Utrecht. It is not surprising that in November leading representatives of the Junker caste who, many though their faults might be, had usually proved willing enough to face the dangers into which they led others, declared in anger that whatever the ultimate fate of Germany might be, William II., by his contemptible end, had damned himself in the eyes of the Prussian nobility. As already stated, the abdication of the Emperor was announced on November 9, but the actual legal document was not signed until November 28. The text of the abdication was as follows:—

"I hereby for all the future, renounce my rights to the Crown of Prussia, and my rights to the German Imperial Crown. At the same time I release all officials of the German Empire and Prussia, as well as all the non-commissioned officers and men of the Navy, and of the Prussian Army and of the Federal contingents, from the Oath of Fealty, which they have made to me as their Kaiser, King, and Supreme Commander. I expect of them that until the re-organisation of the German people, they will assist those who have been entrusted with the duty of protecting the nation against the threatening danger of anarchy, famine, and foreign rule. Given under our own hand and our Imperial Seal. Amerongen, November 28, 1918. (Signed) Wilhelm."

There was much talk in Entente countries about the question of the extradition and trial of the Kaiser. On December 10 the Dutch Prime Minister made a statement in the Lower House in regard to the position. He said that the Government would have preferred that the Kaiser had not sought refuge in Holland. But when he came he had abdicated and was a private person, and consequently could not be interned. The Dutch Government could not have acted differently. No objection to the ex-Kaiser's stay had been as yet made by any

foreign Power. If a request for his extradition were made it would be put to the test of law.

Up to the end of the year no steps had been taken in this matter.

The Crown Prince of Prussia also fled to Holland, and he also issued a formal renunciation of his Royal and Imperial rights. The text of this document was as follows:—

“I expressly and definitely give up all rights of the Crown of Prussia and the Imperial Crown which have devolved upon me, owing to His Majesty, the Emperor’s Abdication, or for other reasons.—Done under my own hand. Wieringen, December 1, 1918. Wilhelm.”

It will be noticed that both the Emperor and the Crown Prince abdicated each for himself alone and not for the whole Hohenzollern House.

After the Revolution there was a curious re-naming of the German political parties, which carried with it, however, no very great change of principles. From the Right to the Left these parties were as follows:—

(1) The German National People’s Party, led by von Kardoff. This represented the old Conservatives. (2) The German People’s Party, representing the old National Liberals, who were led by Herr Stresemann. (3) The Free German People’s Party, representing the old Catholic Centre. (4) The German Democratic Party, representing the old Radicals, with whom a new group called the National Democrats was associated. (5) The Majority Socialists, the chief supporters of the Government. (6) The Independent Socialists, led by Haase and Ledebour, and (7) The Spartacus Group, led by Liebknecht.

Considerable interest attaches to certain revelations which were made officially by the new Bavarian Government at the end of November in regard to the origin of the war. The new Bavarian Government had come into possession of the archives of the royal Government at Munich, and among the archives were discovered some significant communications which Count von Lerchenfeld, the Bavarian Minister in Berlin, made to his own Government in July, 1914. The communications made by von Lerchenfeld proved that the Imperial Government in Berlin were fully aware beforehand of the general tenor, if not of the actual text, of the Austro-Hungarian ultimatum to Serbia. For instance, in one of his communications, von Lerchenfeld says: “It is obvious that Serbia cannot accept such terms, which are inconsistent with her dignity as an independent State. The consequence must therefore be war. It is absolutely agreed here that Austria should take advantage of this favourable moment, even at the danger of further complications.” In his report to Count von Hertling, then Bavarian Prime Minister, von Lerchenfeld also says: “With reference to the Kaiser travelling in a foreign country, and the Chief of the great General Staff, and the Prussian War Minister being on

furlough, the Imperial Government will declare that it was as much surprised as the other Powers by Austria's action."

It is thus definitely stated by Count von Lerchenfeld, than whom nobody was in a better position to give an opinion, that the Berlin Government were fully aware of the action which Austria intended to take, and that they were prepared to encourage their Ally to take such action, even at the risk of war with Russia.

The development of the new situation in Germany had not proceeded far at the end of the year. Besides the King of Prussia, all the other German monarchs renounced their thrones. But the organisation of the Federation—whether or not the number of States in the new Germany should be the same as in the Hohenzollern Federation, whether Germany west of the Rhine should remain within the Federation, and the supremely important question whether German-Austria should now be included within the German republic—all these great questions remained undecided. The two most important questions before the country were apparently this question of the inclusion of German-Austria, and the different problem as to whether the Moderate Political Parties, the Majority Socialists, the Radicals, and the Catholics, would be able to maintain their position against the attacks of the Spartacist agitators. Riots were brought about in Berlin by the Spartacists at the beginning of December, but these were suppressed by the Government without great difficulty, and up to the end of the year the Moderate Parties remained in power, not only in Berlin, but throughout Germany; and they were loyally assisted by all, or nearly all the Independent Socialists, until the very end of December, when after renewed riots the three Independent Socialists resigned from the Cabinet. They were succeeded by Herren Noske, Wissel, and Loebe, all Majority Socialists.

On December 11 great scenes were witnessed in Berlin when the returning Prussian Guard made their formal entry into the capital by the Brandenburg Gate. They were met by Herr Ebert, who delivered a speech full of characteristic German sentiment. He referred to the sufferings and horrors through which the men of the Guard had passed, and declared that they had "sheltered their wives, children, and parents from the flames and slaughter of war." The speaker welcomed the troops in the name of the Socialist Republic, and declared that the future of the German State depended upon the efforts made by them and by their fellows in the works of peace to which they would now turn.

In the middle of December Dr. Solf resigned his post as Foreign Minister, and this appointment was then given by Herr Ebert to Count Rantzau, who had previously been German Minister at Copenhagen.

A few days before Christmas a Congress of the Workers and

Soldiers' Councils (or Soviets) was held in Berlin. The Spartacist leaders made violent speeches at this Congress, but they were heard with impatience, and the Congress ended by passing resolutions in support of the Government.

Whilst these political events were taking place, the mind of Germany was largely concentrated upon the urgent question of food. The country was still very under-nourished, and protests were constantly made against the maintenance of the Blockade by the Allies. And it may be said with truth that the peril of famine overshadowed the opening of the year 1919 in Germany.

II. AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

It is possible that the dissolution of the multifarious Austro-Hungarian Empire will be regarded by historians as the most important event of the year 1918. The development of the conception of nationality during recent years had caused many of the subjects of the Habsburgs to regard the Dual Monarchy as an entirely artificial and unnatural political organism. And the growth of this idea of nationality, based in the main upon linguistic affinity, had proceeded apace during the war. It is possible that a victory of the Central Powers or an early peace on the basis of a compromise would have checked the spread of the new ideas, but the great prolongation of the war, and the acute privations and suffering which it had brought to the civil population of all parts of the monarchy, caused intense political unrest. And the different peoples, seeing that their existing form of government had brought unutterable misery upon them, were spurred to search for a new political ideal.

The situation in the country at the beginning of the year was exceptionally interesting and very intricate. The position was quite unlike that which had existed during the first two years of the war. The death of Francis Joseph and the succession of the Emperor Charles at the end of 1916 had totally altered the situation in Vienna. From the beginning of the war up to that date Austria had been almost entirely eclipsed by her ally, Germany, and by her partner, Hungary. But the young Kaiser soon displayed considerable strength of character, and he succeeded in producing a certain revival of Austrian influence in Central Europe, and this influence was, as might have been expected, relatively beneficent. The Austrian tradition in both foreign and internal politics was superior to the traditions of both Prussia and Hungary. And it will not be forgotten that the Dual Monarchy had been mainly led into the war by a clique of Magyar chauvinists. The Emperor Charles, having had no personal responsibility for the outbreak of the war, was able to co-operate with, and indeed to some extent even to lead, the best elements not only in Austria but in the German Empire, who were aiming with some degree of sincerity at a general peace by understanding. The young

Kaiser had brought about a complete change in the personnel of his Governments. Immediately after his succession he had appointed Count Ottokar Czernin as Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister. The new Minister was a Bohemian nobleman, and he proved himself the most enlightened statesman who had held office in Central Europe during the war. In the summer of 1917, also, the Sovereign had dismissed Count Tisza, the Hungarian Prime Minister, who was one of the most reactionary and at the same time one of the strongest personalities in the Empire.

It is appropriate to summarise here the respective attitudes towards the war of the different nationalities of the Austro-Hungarian realm. It was amongst the Magyars rather than amongst the German-Austrians that the strongest Imperialists were to be found. In the past the treatment of the subject nationalities by the Hungarians had been more tyrannous and more severe than the treatment of those peoples by the Vienna Government; and when the war came it was consequently only natural that the Imperialist designs should find greater favour in Hungary than in Austria. Nevertheless, all parties of German-Austrians, including the Socialists, had supported the war policy of the Austro-Hungarian and Austrian Governments. Apart from the two dominant nationalities, the Governments found their strongest supporters among the Poles of Galicia, and even after the Russian Revolution had removed the fear of a Muscovite tyranny being established in that province, the Poles, or at least the upper classes amongst them, continued to give a discriminating support to the Austrian Government. Hence in the Reichsrat at the beginning of the year the Ministerial majority was made up of Germans and Poles.

Throughout the conflict there had been great opposition expressed by all the other nationalities in the Empire—Czechs, Croats, Slovenes, Serbs, Italians, Rumanians, and Ruthenians. The best organised opposition came from the Czechs, the feud between this nationality and the Germans of Bohemia having become more bitter than ever. Amongst the Croatians, as also amongst the Slovenes, there had existed in the earlier years parties favourable to the war, but the separatist Jugo-Slav propaganda continually spread among both these nationalities; and as concerns the Serbs of the South, only the Mohammedans of Bosnia were willing servants of the Emperor. The Rumanians of Transylvania were almost to a man hostile to the Hungarian Government. The Ruthenian peasants of Eastern Galicia were too ill-educated to be conscious of the real political issues.

The first event that calls for notice is a speech by Count Czernin, delivered to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Austrian Delegation on January 24. In this speech he made a detailed reply to the proposals of peace made by President Wilson, and more particularly to that statesman's famous

Fourteen Points. This speech may therefore be taken as representing the policy of the dying Austro-Hungarian Empire. Count Czernin began by referring to the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk, and he said that the delay in these was due in part to the unprecedented publicity with which they were being conducted. It was intended, he said, that the peace with Russia and with the new States formed out of the Russian Empire, should be a peace without annexations and without indemnities. Count Czernin stated that the negotiations with Ukraina were proceeding more rapidly than the other negotiations, but were being somewhat obstructed by the interference of a Bolshevik Rada sitting at Kharkoff, which claimed that the central Kieff Rada was a capitalist body and did not really represent the Ukrainian State. In regard to Poland, Count Czernin said that Austria desired nothing from that country and only wished that the Polish people should decide their own destiny. Negotiations with Russia were, said the speaker, being delayed by differences of opinion between the Russian and German delegates on the question of the self-determination of the northern territories occupied by Germany. The speaker then passed on to the consideration of President Wilson's policy and Fourteen Points. He said that he welcomed President Wilson's proposals in the main, but it must be understood that Austria-Hungary, faithful to her engagements, would fight to the end in the defence of the pre-war possessions of her Allies, just as much as she would for her own possessions. Moreover, he must politely decline to receive any advice regarding the internal politics of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Count Czernin then dealt *seriatim* with President Wilson's Fourteen Points. He threw doubt on the practicability of abolishing secret diplomacy. He accepted with enthusiasm the proposal for the freedom of the seas. He was equally in favour of the removal of economic boycotts. He believed in the reduction of armaments. Austria-Hungary desired no Russian territory, and he hoped that the differences between the Russian and German Governments would be solved by means of a compromise. He refused in conciliatory language to acquiesce in the irredentist aims of Italy. He believed in a free Poland, and he spoke with favour of the idea of a League of Nations. Count Czernin therefore summarised his attitude towards the American proposals by stating that there was clearly a general agreement between the American and Austro-Hungarian attitudes. Count Czernin concluded his speech by referring somewhat sharply to the criticisms of the Government which had been made by various Austrian politicians.

It is interesting to read this speech of Count Czernin's in connexion with revelations which he subsequently made in regard to his own policy at Brest-Litovsk. Count Czernin, according to statements which he made after the Revolution, urged a much more moderate policy towards Russia. He had

desired that there should be no territorial cessions of any kind, either open or disguised; and he wished that Poland, Lithuania, and the Baltic Provinces should have given them genuine rights of self-determination. He also wished that there should be a general evacuation of the ex-Russian territories even before a general peace was concluded. Count Czernin said, however, that his conciliatory policy was defeated owing to the enormous influence exerted by General von Ludendorff and the other leaders of the military party in Germany.

In the latter half of January riots and strikes broke out in Austria in sympathy with the similar strikes in Germany, the discontent being mainly due to the appalling scarcity of food in the country. These strikes were, however, of short duration, since the Austrian Government possessed the support of the official Socialist party of the German provinces.

The conclusion of peace with Ukraina in February was greeted with great enthusiasm by the people of Vienna and many other parts of Austria, and an enthusiastic manifesto was issued on the subject by the Emperor on February 14. A discordant note was, however, struck by the Austrian Poles, and great anger was expressed by these usually faithful supporters of the Austrian Government. This was due to the inclusion of the Kholm district in the new Ukrainian State. The Poles regarded this district as a rightful part of Poland, and even the Polish members of the Imperial House of Nobles declared that they would vigorously oppose the Austrian Government now that it had made itself responsible for this treaty.

At the beginning of April a sharp controversy arose between Count Czernin and M. Clemenceau, the French Prime Minister, which led within a few weeks to the resignation of the former statesman. In a speech to the Vienna Municipality, Count Czernin stated that before the recent German offensive he had received offers of peace from the French Prime Minister. On being informed of this statement M. Clemenceau stated with characteristic bluntness that "Count Czernin had lied." A long controversy then ensued, in which highly interesting revelations were made in regard to Austrian attempts to obtain peace during 1917. It appeared that as early as the spring of 1917 efforts were made by the Emperor Charles to get into communication with the French Government and to bring about peace. In this he was assisted, it seems, by his brother-in-law, Prince Sixte of Bourbon. According to a statement issued by the French Government, Prince Sixte had received from the Emperor a letter in which the monarch referred to the "just French claims in regard to Alsace-Lorraine." The Austrian Government declared that the meaning of the letter had been falsified by the French. It transpired, however, that long indirect conversations had taken place throughout the summer and autumn of 1917 between the French and Austro-Hungarian Governments. The chief intermediaries appear to

have been Count Revertata on the side of Austria, and Major Armand on the side of France. The most important negotiations took place whilst M. Ribot was French Prime Minister, but neither these nor subsequent negotiations had any definite result. The conversations between the two intermediaries continued in Switzerland till February, 1918, when they finally broke down over the question of Alsace-Lorraine, France refusing to make any concession upon this matter, and the Austrian representative being aware that it was useless to ask Germany to alter her standpoint upon that issue. These revelations placed the Emperor Charles in such an uncomfortable position that it was inevitable that Count Czernin should resign, and on April 15 the resignation of the Foreign Minister was formally announced. It was clear, however, that the exact truth in regard to these secret negotiations, and in regard to the parts played by the Emperor Charles, Prince Sixte, and Count Czernin, had not transpired through any of the revelations then made by either the French or the Austro-Hungarian Government.

Baron Burian succeeded Count Czernin as Foreign Minister and President of the Joint Government. Baron Burian had been Foreign Minister earlier in the war; he was a Hungarian statesman and was much more reactionary in his views than Count Czernin.

The period between May and the end of September witnessed a gradual weakening of the whole structure of the Dual Monarchy. Everywhere the subordinate nationalities were becoming more and more independent of the Central Government. The Croats, many of whom had been loyal in the past, were becoming more and more separatist. The Czechs were even more bitter against the Austrians than in earlier days, and even the Poles were now seething with discontent. The weakness of the whole machinery of the government of the Empire was shown by the constant attempts of the leading statesmen to resign. Several attempts were made during the first six months of the year by Dr. von Seidler, the Austrian Premier, to induce the Emperor to relieve him of his responsibilities, and Dr. Werkle, the Hungarian Premier, acted in like manner. At last, at the end of July the Emperor decided to accept Dr. von Seidler's resignation. Baron von Hussarek was appointed in his place. The new Prime Minister succeeded in mollifying somewhat the hostile Poles, but the Czechs and the Jugo-Slavs remained entirely hostile to the Austrian Government. Baron von Hussarek, in spite of some conciliatory speeches, remained a representative of the old school of German dominance in Austria. For instance, in one of his earliest speeches in the Reichsrat, he declared: "Austria will only achieve its mission when it is in reality the common Fatherland of all the races of its family of peoples, but it will only reach this goal provided it is always conscious that the source of its civilisation and power lies in the German race."

In the middle of May the Emperor Charles, possibly with a view to destroying the effects of M. Clemenceau's revelations, paid a visit to the German Headquarters, and after this event it was announced that a renewal had taken place of the Austro-German alliance. Owing to the subsequent defeat of the Central Powers these negotiations between the two Central Powers possessed no practical significance, but it is of interest to record that the proposed terms of the alliance provided for a unified military system of the two Powers, and for closer economic relations than had existed before the war.

As the defeats of the German armies in the West became more and more evident, so Germany's feeble composite ally gradually crumbled to pieces more and more rapidly. The Czechs and the Jugo-Slavs became more and more daring in their declarations of independence, and it was a sign of coming events when, on August 13, the British Government recognised the Czecho-Slovaks as an allied nation. The text of the British declaration was as follows:—

“Since the beginning of the war the Czecho-Slovak nation has resisted the common enemy by every means in its power. The Czecho-Slovaks have constituted a considerable army, fighting on three different battle-fields, and attempting in Russia and Siberia to arrest the Germanic invasion. In consideration of its efforts to achieve independence Great Britain regards the Czecho-Slovaks as an allied nation, and recognises the unity of the three Czecho-Slovak armies as an allied and belligerent army waging regular warfare against Austria-Hungary and Germany. Great Britain also recognises the right of the Czecho-Slovak National Council as the supreme organ of the Czecho-Slovak national interest, and as the present trusted means of the future Czecho-Slovak Government to exercise supreme authority over this allied and belligerent army.”

In view of all these events, the Government of the Dual Monarchy made desperate attempts in September and October to extricate itself from the war before the Habsburg Empire had finally ceased to exist. On September 14 the Austro-Hungarian Government addressed a circular Note to all the belligerent and neutral Governments and to the Papal See. The Note was of great length. The Austro-Hungarian Government stated that ever since December, 1916, the question of peace had been tentatively discussed, and urged that in spite of the divergencies of aims which had been revealed on territorial and other matters, yet it might be productive of good results if negotiations were still further pursued on a still more definite basis. The Note proposed that a Conference should be held between representatives of the belligerents, this Conference to be non-binding and secret, but to investigate thoroughly the question as to whether a possible basis for a general peace existed. The Austro-Hungarian Government believed that in this way “mountains of old misunderstandings might be removed and many

new things might be perceived," and the Austro-Hungarian authorities hoped that in this way a satisfactory basis for a peace would be discovered.

This belated attempt of the Austro-Hungarian Government to obtain a peace by compromise was promptly rejected by the Allies; but in one form or another the desperate attempts of the Imperial Authorities to save the Empire from extinction continued through the next six weeks.

On October 1 Baron Hussarek delivered a speech of general interest in the Austrian House of Representatives. He said that the recent Bulgarian armistice had undoubtedly created a somewhat serious position, but, in association with Germany, the Government had taken military measures to meet the new situation. He said that the circular Note of September 14 had been an earnest attempt to save mankind from the present tortures. The Premier went on to refer at considerable length to the Polish question. He said that the future Polish Constitution was a matter which would be left to the self-determination of the Poles; but Austrians could not be blamed if they encouraged the idea of a close association between Poland and Vienna. Referring to the future government of Austria, Baron Hussarek said that the guiding principle must be that of full autonomy for each race. The Prime Minister's speech was received by the Czech representatives with great hostility.

During the first half of October the fragments of the complex Empire continued to fall apart, and it may be said that by the middle of October the Emperor's writ had ceased to run in many parts of his dominions.

On October 15 a speech of general interest was delivered by Baron Burian to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Hungarian Delegation. He said that the question of peace had recently come rapidly to the fore. He pointed out that on October 4 the Austro-Hungarian Government, in agreement with Germany and Turkey, had addressed a Note to President Wilson asking for the opening of negotiations. The Foreign Minister then referred in laudatory terms to President Wilson's speech of September 27, which, he said, had been received sympathetically in Austria-Hungary. In regard to President Wilson's preliminary reply to the German Chancellor's Note of October 4, Baron Burian declared that Austria-Hungary, like Germany, was willing to agree to President Wilson's proposal that the occupied territories should be evacuated. The Baron also spoke with favour of the idea of a League of Nations.

On October 17 a manifesto was issued in Vienna by the Emperor, addressed to all the Austrian peoples. The manifesto, which was intended to meet the Nationalist ambitions of the different peoples, declared at the outset that since his Accession the Emperor had striven consistently to bring peace to his peoples. The manifesto then went on to declare that Austria

should now become a federal State, the States being founded on national lines. The scheme, however, was apparently the same utterly inadequate conception which had been set forth officially in the previous year (see A.R., 1917, page [231]). This was obvious from the fact that it was stated that the integrity of Hungary would not be affected. It was also apparently the intention of the Kaiser to cede the Polish territory of Austria to Independent Poland. The chief interest of this manifesto lies in the fact that it proves that even up to the eleventh hour the Magyar oligarchy had successfully opposed any real nationalist reorganisation of the Empire.

Before the end of September a Czecho-Slovak National Council had formally come into existence in Prague, and on October 15 a general strike took place in the city, and the inauguration of the Czecho-Slovak Republic was announced by placards. The movement extended to certain other Bohemian towns. Similar events occurred in Croatia. On October 15 a Jugo-Slav National Council held a meeting at Agram, in which the independence of the Jugo-Slav territories was proclaimed, the idea being that Croatia should be the core of the new State, with Agram as the capital. This Jugo-Slav National Council had been brought into existence at Agram ten days earlier, and it had been founded by representatives of Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, Istria, Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Southern Hungary. Proclamations declaring the independence of the Jugo-Slav people were also issued by the Jugo-Slav Parliamentary Club in Vienna. The leading personalities in this movement were Dr. Korosek, Dr. Balat, and Mr. Raditch.

The Austro-Hungarian Government were quite incapable of suppressing these "treasonable" manifestations, and indeed they did not even attempt to do so. At the end of October the last attempt was made to obtain peace, Austria-Hungary this time acting quite independently of her Allies. Baron Burian resigned, and Count Andrássy became Foreign Minister, and it was he who was responsible for this last Note. Count Andrássy's Note was as follows:—

"In reply to the Note which President Wilson on October 18 addressed to the Austro-Hungarian Government, and in the sense of the decision of the President to deal in part with Austria-Hungary in regard to the question of an armistice and peace, the Austro-Hungarian Government has the honour to declare that, as in the case of the preceding statements of the President, it also adheres to his point of view, as laid down in his last Note, in regard to the rights of the peoples of Austria-Hungary, particularly those of the Czecho-Slovaks and the Jugo-Slavs. Consequently, as Austria-Hungary accepts all the conditions upon which the President makes an entry into negotiations with regard to an armistice and peace dependent, nothing now stands in the way, in the opinion of the Austro-Hungarian Government, of the commencement of pourparlers.

The Austro-Hungarian Government declares itself in consequence prepared, without awaiting the result of other negotiations, to enter into pourparlers in regard to peace between Austria-Hungary and the States of the opposing Party, and in regard to an immediate armistice on all the fronts of Austria-Hungary. It begs President Wilson to be good enough to make overtures on this subject."

In the meantime a great offensive had been launched by the Italians against the Austrian armies, and this resulted in the absolute collapse of the Austrian lines, the loss of many hundreds of guns, and hundreds of thousands of prisoners, and within a few days the Austro-Hungarian Army may almost be said to have ceased to exist. An account of these operations will be found in "The European War," Chapter III. Count Andrassy, therefore, followed up his Note to President Wilson by another urgent appeal to Mr. Lansing, the American Secretary of State. Both Baron Hussarek and Count Werkle resigned their positions. On October 26 it was announced that the Emperor had entrusted Prof. Lammasch, the well-known Liberal, with the formation of an Austrian Cabinet. Prof. Lammasch agreed to undertake this task, but he immediately made it known that his Cabinet was merely what was called "a Liquidation Ministry," the object of which was to transfer the functions of the Imperial Austrian Government to the now thoroughly established National Governments. The formation of a new Hungarian Ministry caused somewhat greater difficulty, but after a few days, it was announced that Count Karolyi had become Premier of an independent Hungary.

In the meantime, whilst the other nationalities were crystallising out, the German-Austrians, the Austrians properly so-called, became conscious of the necessity which had now arisen to constitute themselves into a definite German State. On October 21 a constituent meeting of the "National Assembly of German-Austria" was held in the Diet House of the province of Lower Austria. A certain Herr Seitz was President of this meeting, and the well-known Socialist, Herr Adler, who died suddenly the following month, also took a prominent part in the conference. Resolutions were passed declaring that a State of German-Austria had been founded, and that it included all the German-speaking territories of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the small territory of German Bohemia being particularly mentioned.

On October 24 there was a mutiny on the part of certain Croatian regiments stationed in Fiume, and the mutineers succeeded in obtaining control of the port. Some attempt seems to have been made by the Magyar authorities to restore their control of the town, but with little success, and thereafter Fiume became a possession of the new Croatian State. On October 28 all the functions of government in the Czecho-Slovak territories were taken over by the Czecho-Slovak National Council in Prague, and on the following day a similar assumption of authority occurred on the part of the Croatian Diet.

A feature of the Revolution in Hungary which ought to be mentioned, is the murder of Count Tisza by revolutionary soldiers. The Count was murdered in his own house on the evening of October 31 by three revolutionary soldiers. The crime appears to have been committed with a cruelty worthy of the Russian Bolsheviks. The statesman was shot in the presence of his wife, the murderers declaring that their deed was vengeance for Count Tisza's part in causing the war.

The Hungarian Cabinet, formed under the presidency of Count Karolyi, included Count Batthany as Foreign Minister and M. Nazy, who was responsible for finance and for the affairs of the "nationalities."

On November 1 the affairs of Austria Proper were taken over by the new German-Austrian State Council, and Herr Seitz became President of the new State. It was significant that even in German-Austria the sentiment was entirely republican, and from the time when the revolutions broke out in the different capitals in the second half of October, it became evident that the unfortunate young Emperor could not do other than abdicate. Herr Seitz announced at the outset that the desire of Austria would be to be readmitted to the German Federation, and throughout the remaining weeks of the year it appeared evident that there was little difference of opinion upon this point in Austria. Herr Seitz also declared that the German-speaking portion of Tirol was an integral part of German-Austria, but his declaration on this point did not prevent the Italians from occupying Innsbrück shortly after the conclusion of the armistice. A separate Council was formed provisionally for the German-speaking districts of North-Western Bohemia, and a certain Herr Seliger became President of this German-Bohemian Council. Before the end of the year, however, Czech troops invaded the German-speaking districts, and suppressed by force the independent existence of this district.

Whilst these events were taking place, the young Kaiser Karl made no formal abdication, but it was universally known that he intended to do so. The Emperor did not remain in Vienna, but stayed during these critical days in one of his castles in Hungary. He was not molested in any way by the revolutionaries, and in German-Austria and Hungary little or no hostility was felt towards him. On November 12 the formal Proclamation of Abdication was issued. The Proclamation was as follows :—

"Ever since my accession to the throne I have unceasingly tried to deliver my peoples from the tremendous war, for which I bear no responsibility. I have not retarded the re-establishment of constitutional life, and I have reopened to my people the way to solid national development. Filled with unalterable love for all my peoples, I will not in my person be a hindrance to their free development. I acknowledge the decision of German-Austria to take for the future the form of a separate State.

The people have by their deputies taken charge of the Government. I relinquish all participation in the administration of the State. I likewise release my Austrian ministers from their offices. May the German-Austrian people harmoniously and peacefully adjust themselves to the new conditions. The happiness of my peoples has from the beginning been the object of my warmest wishes. Internal peace alone will be able to heal the wounds which this war has caused. (Signed) Charles. (Countersigned) Lammasch."

On the day following the issue of this somewhat pathetic Proclamation, Prof. Lammasch, the last Austrian Premier in the old sense, resigned, and with his resignation the Austrian Empire formally ceased to exist. Four days later Charles abdicated from the Hungarian throne.

During the last few weeks of the year the development of affairs in the more important of the now entirely independent national States proceeded smoothly. Definite German, Czecho-Slovak, Jugo-Slav, and Hungarian States were formed; but the other national territories being akin to neighbouring independent Powers did not themselves become independent States. Thus the Italian districts were annexed by Italy, the Rumanian districts of Hungary attached themselves to Rumania, and in Galicia war broke out between the Polish and Ukrainian sections of the population, considerable areas of that province being debatable territory as between those two nationalities. It was also alleged that great cruelties and pogroms were perpetrated by the Poles against the Galician Jews, particularly in Lemberg.

The Czecho-Slovak Cabinet was completed on November 16. Dr. Kramarz became Prime Minister. Dr. Benes was Foreign Minister. M. Stanek became Minister of Public Works, and M. Stefanik became Minister of War. Prof. Masaryk became first President of the Czecho-Slovak Republic. Prof. Masaryk and Dr. Kramarz had long been the leading advocates of Bohemian independence. The Bohemian Prime Minister announced that the Western Powers had agreed that all Bohemia, including the German-speaking districts, should be given to the new Czecho-Slovak Republic.

M. Korosek was the first Premier of the new Jugo-Slav Government, but in December it was announced that a union had taken place between Serbia and the Jugo-Slav State, formed out of the southern provinces of Austria-Hungary. M. Pashich, Serbian Prime Minister, became first Premier of the united State, M. Korosek being Vice-Premier. The well-known Jugo-Slav propagandist, M. Trumbitch, became Minister for Foreign Affairs.

In Hungary Count Karolyi continued in power till the end of the year, and the disintegration of Hungary at the end of the year had not proceeded so far as in the case of Austria. Indeed, the Hungarian Government seem to have hoped to be able to preserve a large part of the Hungarian territory by

means of bestowing a generous measure of autonomy upon the different nationalities. It was announced in December that the elections for the Hungarian Constituent Assembly would be held in the second week in January.

The position of German-Austria was more unhappy than that of any of the other three greater States. This was due to the fact that Austria Proper had for many years been dependent for a large part of its food supplies upon the resources of the neighbouring provinces of the Dual Empire. German-Austria was not self-supporting. The first action of the Czecho-Slovak Government was to cut off all exports of food from the Czecho-Slovak territory to German-Austria, and a similar hostile action was taken by the Jugo-Slav Government. Even the Hungarian Government placed obstacles in the way of sending assistance to Austria. All over the country of the new South German State, therefore, privation and actual starvation were rife. And bad as the conditions were in the small towns, and even in the country districts, the position was much worse in Vienna. The glory of the ancient capital of Germany had departed. Vienna, which a few years earlier had been one of the gayest and most brilliant cities in the world, was now plunged into misery. The magnitude of Vienna and its huge population, which had been the sign and symbol of its historic Imperial position, were now the chief cause of its undoing. For the city was now much too great for the small territory of which it remained the capital. The tragic end which had overtaken the Habsburg Monarchy and the Habsburg system of government in Central Europe, could not have been better typified than in the pitiful condition of Vienna at the end of the year.

CHAPTER III.

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE — THE MUSCOVITE REPUBLIC — UKRAINIA — SIBERIA — POLAND — FINLAND — MINOR RUSSIAN STATES — TURKEY — RUMANIA — BULGARIA — GREECE — SERBIA — MONTENEGRO — ALBANIA.

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE.

It is more than possible that the Russian Revolution should be reckoned the most important event in European history since the Reformation. Writers have already likened the Revolution and its consequences to the decay and dissolution of the Roman Empire, and the comparison has much truth in it. As compared with the mighty events of 1917, the French Revolution was but a petty and local affair. France was, after all, only one of the number of States composing Western Europe, and in the end her political convulsions left little or no permanent effects outside her own boundaries. Russia, however, was half Europe. Almost the whole of the great religio-political entity—for it is

an entity—which we call Eastern Europe, had come under the sway of the Tsarism. It is this which gives the Revolution its likeness to the Fall of Rome. It was not an event of merely national dimensions. Half a continent, half the greatest of continents, was involved, and—as also in the case of Rome—huge extra-European territories were immediately and directly affected by the downfall.

In order to appreciate rightly the course of events and to comprehend the sudden appearance of a whole group of new States upon the map of Europe, it is necessary to stress this point, that the name Russia was synonymous, not only geographically, but historically and sociologically with "Eastern Europe." Not in size only, but in another and deeper sense, Russia was comparable not to a single country of Western Europe, but to all the countries of Western Europe considered collectively. The events of recent years have made a threefold division of Europe familiar to all, and such is convenient for certain purposes. But the historic, the secular, division of Europe is twofold, not threefold. Since the beginning, since the countries of Europe emerged from the pre-historic period into the light of the historic epoch, there has been an Eastern Europe and a Western Europe. And the dividing line through all history has been neither political nor linguistic, but ecclesiastical. Eastern Europe derived its religion from Byzantium: it was Greek Orthodox. Western Europe received its religion from Rome. It is this age-long ecclesiastical division extending through nearly 1,000 years of Christian history before the Reformation and the Renaissance, which left the twofold division of Europe a fundamental reality, even after the Reformation had caused internecine ecclesiastical divisions within Western Europe, and after the Renaissance had caused other matters largely to displace ecclesiastical affairs in the minds of men. It thus comes about that if we remember the true analogy which exists between Russia and Western Europe as a whole, there would appear to be nothing essentially improbable in the idea that a whole group of nations will be permanently established on the wreck of the Russian Empire.

If we judge by the historic ecclesiastical criterion, we shall see that the Tsardom included all Eastern Europe, except Rumania and the Balkan Peninsula. But when the Tsar's Government collapsed there was no power strong enough to hold together that vast territory, and the component parts sought to shape their political destinies for themselves. The Muscovite had been, however, an imperial and aggressive race, and the Empire established and extended by Muscovite arms had expanded powerfully to the west and had come to include countries which belonged historically and culturally to Western Europe. Such was the position of Poland, and of the Baltic Provinces, and also of Finland. These countries had all been part of Roman Catholic Europe, and they had either remained

Catholic or had become Lutheran. The Russian domination had been only a domination, and had not altered the essential character of the countries. It was this affinity of these territories to Western Europe which gave Berlin and Vienna, particularly the latter, the opportunity to win the support of the upper and middle classes of the countries, and in this sense it was only natural that, after the breakdown of the Russian State, Poland and the other States mentioned should revert to that Central European system from which they had only been separated by violence. The lower classes, however, so far as they were politically conscious, were mainly extreme Socialists, or Bolsheviks, and in this they represented an entirely new factor in the problem. Bolshevism, whether as an ideal or as a reality, had little or nothing in common with any polity or state of society which had ever existed either in Western or in Eastern Europe. It may be said, therefore, that pending a final settlement of the whole war, Poland tended to revert to an association with Austria, the Baltic Provinces (in which, be it remembered, the governing classes were German) tended towards the German Empire, and that Finland, chiefly owing to the inactivity of the Swedish Government, also came under the protection of Berlin.

It was not only in the extreme west that great provinces began to fall away. Russia, European Russia, had not only expanded westwards beyond its true and natural boundaries, and had not only—quite legitimately and laudably—united the great Siberian dominion to its own body, but it had also encroached upon the Orient. The Russian arms had united Turkestan and Trans-Caucasia with the Russian Empire. It was, therefore, only natural that these oriental countries should fall away, and a republic of Turkestan was founded in January, 1918, and in Caucasia a number of small States made their appearance. Similarly, the tributary States of Bokhara and Khiva declared their complete independence. The most serious schisms were, however, in the body of Russia Proper, which had come to include Siberia, for the great colony of Siberia was as much a part of Russia as Australia was a part of Englishry. In December, 1917, an Independent Republic of Siberia, with its capital at Tomsk, was proclaimed, the Siberians being unwilling to submit to Petrograd now that the former Central Government had fallen into the hands of the Bolsheviks. Similarly, the important nation of Little Russia (Ukrainia or Ruthenia) declared its independence, and entered into separate negotiations with the Central Powers in January. Finally, also in January, a Cossack Republic of the Don was founded, the Cossacks always having been hostile to the extreme Socialists. Of a somewhat different character was the secession of Bessarabia, which contained a majority of Rumanians. This province declared its independence at the end of December, and in April announced that it desired to be united with Rumania. Owing to these

developments it came about that the Central Government which was first established in Petrograd, and later in Moscow, came to rule over a comparatively limited area in Central Russia. The Bolshevik Government in Moscow represented only Great Russia, or Muscovy. And hence, in dealing with the course of events during 1918 it will be necessary to consider all these different States separately.

THE MUSCOVITE REPUBLIC.

As explained in the foregoing paragraphs, the dissolution of the Russian Empire had proceeded so far that not only had the essentially foreign border lands broken away from the Russian State, but the Russian nation itself had been rent into pieces, so that the State which continued to call itself Russia and which was still diplomatically known as Russia, was in reality only a part of the Russian nation and to the eye of the historian was immediately seen to be a strange resuscitation of what in former centuries was known as Muscovy. Yet, just as Muscovy was the heart and core of Russia in the seventeenth and earlier centuries, so now it was the central and northern provinces of Russia which held most strongly to an independent life, apart both from the influence and protection of the Central Powers, and from the influence and guidance of the Entente and the United States of America. The border States of the West came immediately under the domination of Germany, and as will be seen later, large parts of Siberia, and subsequently a part of the north of European Russia came to be dependent upon the Entente. But the revived State of Muscovy was entirely independent, and represented a force in the world which was quite different from the influence exercised by either of the great belligerent groups, and was truly neutral in regard to both of them. But if Muscovy, in the territorial sense and in the sense that it was not dominated by foreigners, truly represented the Muscovy of the past, in almost all other respects it was entirely changed. The new Muscovite State was the creation of the extreme type of socialism known as Bolshevism. And Bolshevism was an entirely new development not only in Russia, but in the world; and it presented the sharpest possible contrast to the polity which had existed in Russia before the fall of Tsarism.

Up to the time of the Bolshevik *coup d'état* in November, 1917, Russia may be said to have continued to exist as a State, because it was not until that event that the Muscovite and Ukrainian sections of the country had definitely fallen apart. And, of course, it was not until the same date that Muscovy had taken on the new and extraordinary character which separated it so strikingly from the Russia of the past. The two men who were primarily responsible for the *coup d'état* and the consequent formation of the new Bolshevik Republic were

Vladimir Ilitch Ulianov-Lenin and Leo Trotsky. Both these politicians had long been known as extreme revolutionaries, and prior to the Russian Revolution, the former had been living in Switzerland and the latter in the United States, since neither dared to enter his own country in the days of the Tsar. When the Bolsheviks obtained power in Petrograd, M. Ilitch Ulianov-Lenin became Prime Minister and M. Leo Trotsky became Foreign Minister, and it appears that these two dominant personalities hoped at first to be able to control the whole of Russia; and they proceeded at once to hold the elections for an all-Russian Constituent Assembly and to convoke that body.

The meeting of the Constituent Assembly, which was opened in Petrograd on January 18, afforded a conclusive proof of the disbelief of the Bolsheviks in the principles of democracy. The Constituent Assembly was indeed a very imperfect diet. It was opened whilst many of the constituencies had as yet not returned their delegates; and even the delegates who had arrived were elected on the strength of polling machinery which, in practice, was very imperfect. Nevertheless, the assembly had some claim to be regarded as a democratic parliament elected on the traditional territorial basis. From the outset, however, the Assembly was suspect in the eyes of the Government; for in the diet the Bolshevik Party was in the minority. The majority of the deputies belonged to the combined groups of Moderate Socialists, mainly to the so-called Socialist Revolutionaries. The non-Socialist Parties, who were now all combined under the name of Cadets, were but an extremely small minority of the Assembly. At this period of the year, however, the Moderate Socialists were inclined to combine with the so-called Bourgeois Parties against the Bolshevik Extremists; and hence M. Lenin's Cabinet found itself facing a hostile Assembly which, whatever might be its imperfections, had a far better right to speak for Russia than had the extremist Government. The majority possessed by the Moderate Socialists in the Assembly was due to the fact that 90 per cent. of the Ukrainian constituencies had returned the candidates belonging to this Party.

The Assembly was opened on January 18 by M. Sverdloff, Chairman of the Central Executive Committee of Soviets, who read a Declaration of the Committee, stating that Russia was a Republic of Soviets, and announcing various "rights" of the working classes. M. Sverdloff called upon the Constituent Assembly to approve this Declaration of the Soviets. The Declaration was received with great enthusiasm by the Bolshevik members. An opposing Declaration was then read by M. Tseretelli (who had been a Minister in M. Kerensky's Government in the previous year) on behalf of the Moderate Socialists. M. Tseretelli boldly condemned the usurpation of the Bolsheviks, and he declared that the supreme power in the Russian Republic ought to be vested in the Constituent Assembly. He said that the conditions under which the Assembly met were

disgraceful; the delegates were faced by threats of violence, there was no inviolability of person, and no real liberty of speech. The Moderate Socialists' Declaration ended with an appeal to the working classes to refuse to submit to the dictatorship of the Bolshevik minority, and to support the Constituent Assembly. After M. Lenin himself had spoken, at the end of the sitting a vote was taken on the Soviet Declaration proposed by M. Sverdloff, and the Declaration was rejected by 273 votes to 140, the minority consisting of the Bolsheviks and a few of the more extreme Socialist Revolutionaries.

The Bolsheviks soon showed that they did not intend to submit to the authority of the Constituent Assembly. On the following day, January 19, a decree was issued by the Government dissolving the Assembly. The decree contained a long and unconvincing explanation concerning what it described as the unduly bourgeois character of the Constituent Assembly.

The meeting and dissolution of the Constituent Assembly must be regarded as the most important political event in Muscovy during the year. Whatever doubt there may have been before, it became clear after this event that the Bolshevik Government was merely the dictatorship of a proletarian minority based upon an unscrupulous display of force. The dissolution of the Assembly also hastened the schism between Muscovy and Ukrainia. The Ukrainian delegates had already appeared at Brest-Litovsk, and the decision of the Kieff authorities to assert their independence of Petrograd, was naturally strengthened by the scant courtesy with which the Party possessing an overwhelming majority in Ukrainia had been treated in the Russian capital. After the dissolution of the Assembly there was no longer any hope of maintaining Russian unity, and Muscovy embarked upon a sanguinary career of disastrous anarchy.

The Bolshevik tyranny was of a most savage and bloodthirsty character. The Bolshevik agitators encouraged by every means a sentiment of intense bitterness against all who did not belong to the proletariat, and even against members of the working classes, such as the Socialist Revolutionaries, who did not express the same violent sentiments. In all parts of Muscovy, and in the other territories of Russia into which the barbarous "Red Guards" (bands of armed Bolsheviks) were able to penetrate, wholesale murders of members of the upper classes occurred. The murders often occurred even where no motive of robbery existed, and were often accompanied by the most horrible cruelties. Women and children were not spared. Thus, in the town of Rostoff-on-Don, the Red Guards were wont to wait outside the schools to which the bourgeoisie sent their children, and maltreated and often killed the children as they came out. And there was no redress for these atrocities. It is therefore not surprising that in Rostoff-on-Don, as indeed in many other parts of what was the Russian Empire, the re-

spectable elements of society were, in the spring, literally praying for the arrival of German troops.

The course of the negotiations between the Muscovite delegates and the Central Powers at Brest-Litovsk is fully described elsewhere (see "The European War," Chapter I). A Congress of Soviets was held at Moscow in March for the purpose of ratifying the Treaty with the Central Powers. Over 1,000 delegates were present, and on March 14 the Congress ratified the Treaty of Peace by 453 votes to 30. In addressing the Congress, M. Lenin said that the Government were forced to conclude a peace on the terms dictated by German Imperialism, which was at present too powerful for Russia. Nevertheless, they need not regard the peace as more than temporary, and they would "await the moment when the European Proletariat would come to their assistance."

One of the first actions of the Bolsheviks after they seized power, was to declare that they would repudiate the Russian National Debt. On March 8 it was announced that the Soviet authorities would carry this repudiation into effect.

On March 9 it was announced that all the State institutions in Petrograd would be transferred to Moscow, which would in future be the Russian capital. On March 8 M. Trotsky resigned the post of Minister for Foreign Affairs, and he was succeeded in that appointment by M. Tchitcherin. M. Trotsky had disagreed with the Premier on the question of signing the peace with the Germans, but he remained in M. Lenin's Cabinet, and took over the post of Minister for Military and Naval Affairs.

As part of the campaign which the Muscovite Government waged against the upper classes and all the institutions which had characterised Tsarism, decrees were issued early in the year disestablishing and disendowing the Church. All Church property was declared to be nationalised, and all connexion between religion and the Muscovite State was severed. In answer to these decrees, the Patriarch of the Orthodox Church, whose name was Tikhon, appealed to all Christians vigorously to oppose the Bolsheviks, and the Prelate formally excommunicated the entire Bolshevik Party.

Among the persons murdered by the Bolsheviks during the year were many Ministers of the former Tsarist régime, and also leading statesmen of the Kerensky period; thus M. Trepoff, the former Prime Minister, was among those "legally" shot. It is of some interest to record, however, that the notorious War Minister, M. Sukhomlinoff, escaped with his life to Finland. As described elsewhere, the ex-Tsar Nicholas was murdered by the Bolsheviks of the so-called Ural Regional Council on July 16.¹ It was afterwards reported that the Tsarina, the Tsarevitch, and the remaining members of the Imperial family were murdered at the same time as the Tsar.

¹ See Obituary, p. 185.

At the beginning of July there was a revolt by the extreme section of the Socialist Revolutionaries in Moscow who had now fallen out with the Bolsheviks. And some of the Revolutionaries succeeded in assassinating the German Ambassador to Muscovy, Count Mirbach. Since the assassination was not committed by Bolsheviks, the deed led to no renewal of complications between the Muscovite and German Governments. At the beginning of September there was an outbreak of violence on the part of the Red Guards in Petrograd, and Captain Francis Cronie, the British Naval Attaché, was murdered by the unruly troops.

Throughout the year the Bolsheviks of Muscovy were undertaking military operations in all the surrounding States. Everywhere the Muscovite Government and the Muscovite troops met with the sympathy of the local Bolsheviks, whether in Siberia, Ukraina, the Baltic Provinces, or elsewhere. The creed of Bolshevism was a binding force. The Muscovites, who were at war with the Cossacks, also invaded Ukraina, and were only driven out by German troops; they likewise invaded Esthonia and Livonia, and there also they were ejected by German armies. In various parts of the huge territory of Siberia, the Bolsheviks, assisted by German and Austrian prisoners, were at work endeavouring to suppress and over-awe the more moderate sections of the population. And, finally, during the latter half of the year, they were engaged in a war of a more formal character against Entente troops who were landed at Archangel. On August 2 French and British troops were landed at Archangel, and were greeted with enthusiasm by the local population, even according to the Bolshevik accounts. The chief object of this expedition was to prevent any possibility of the Germans establishing themselves at the port. It was stated that only 8,000 Muscovite troops were present in that region, and the fighting was therefore not of a serious character, though during the next few months small actions took place between the Entente troops and the Red Guards. Another detachment of this northern force was landed at Murmansk. These two small forces at Archangel and Murmansk were under the command of General Poole, and it was reported in the autumn that the commissariat department of these forces was acting under the advice of Sir Ernest Shackleton, the famous Antarctic explorer. An American contingent was also present.

After the conclusion of the armistice between Germany and the Western Powers, which had the effect of almost completely disarming Germany, the Muscovites were again able to expand westwards. And during November and December the unfortunate inhabitants of Livonia and Esthonia were again exposed to the dreadful depredations of the thieving and murdering bands of Red Guards.

UKRAINIA.

One of the most interesting developments of the year was the establishment and growth of the new independent State of *Ukrainia*, or *Little Russia*. The three terms, *Little Russians*, *Ukrainians*, and *Ruthenians* were synonyms, but it appeared that the authorities of the new State preferred to term themselves *Ukrainians*. It needs to be emphasised that the *Ukrainians* are *Russians*, and bear the same relationship to *Muscovites* and other *Russians* that the inhabitants of the different provinces of the *Iberian Peninsula* bear to one another, or—to take a different example—that the several *Scandinavian* nations bear to one another. The establishment of an independent *Ukrainian Republic* was therefore a phenomenon totally unlike the secession of *Poland*, *Finland*, or the *Baltic Provinces* from *Russia*: it involved a schism in the body of *Russia*. If, therefore, the separate existence of *Ukrainia* should become a permanency, the position thus established would be a political anomaly comparable to the century-long *Portuguese* independence of the rest of *Iberia*.

Immediately after the *Russian Revolution* in *March, 1917*, representatives of *Ukrainia* met in *Kieff* and established a diet called the “*Rada*,” which was to be the parliament of *Ukrainia*. *Ukrainia*, it was announced, was to include the following *Russian Governments*: *Kieff*, *Podolia*, *Volhynia*, *Chernigoff*, *Poltava*, *Kharkoff*, *Ekaterinoslav*, *Kherson*, and *Taurida*. It was at first contemplated that the new State should be a semi-autonomous member of a *Federal Russian Republic*, and whilst *M. Kerensky* was in power, the *Kieff Rada* was in fairly complete sympathy with what was still the *All-Russian Government*. When, however, the *Bolsheviks* seized power in *Petrograd*, the much more enlightened *Ukrainian Government* became very hostile to *Petrograd*. On *December 23* a definite *Ukrainian Constitution* was adopted by the *Rada*, and at the beginning of *January* separate *Ukrainian delegates* made their appearance at *Brest-Litovsk* in order to negotiate peace with the *Central Powers*. The succeeding negotiations between the *Ukrainians* and the *Central Powers* proceeded amicably and satisfactorily, much to the chagrin of the delegates from *Petrograd*. On *January 11* the chairman of the *Ukrainian Delegation*, *M. Bolubovuish* (who was the *Minister of Commerce*), issued a declaration to the *Conference* and to the world at large. The declaration was as follows:—

“The *Ukrainian People’s Republic* was proclaimed by the *Ukrainian Central Rada* on *November 20, 1917*, and by this *Act of State* the international position of the *Republic* was determined. Striving for the creation of a confederation of all the *Republics* which have arisen on the territory of the former *Russian Empire*, the *Ukrainian People’s Republic*, through its *Secretariat-General*, proceeds to enter into independent relations

pending the time when the formation of a Federal Government in Russia shall have been completed, and the regulation of the relations between the Ukraine, on the one hand, and the Government of the future Federation, on the other, shall have been achieved."

The negotiations at Brest-Litovsk were the occasion for serious internecine squabbles between the Muscovite delegates and the Ukrainian representatives, and before the end of January the Ukrainian territory was invaded by large numbers of Bolshevik troops from Muscovy, who were actuated, not only by political hostility towards the Ukrainian people, but also by a desire to seize the Ukrainian food supplies, which were much less inadequate than those of the other parts of Russia.

On February 9 peace was signed between the Ukrainian People's Republic, on the one side, and Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria, on the other side. The Treaty consisted of 10 Articles. There were to be no indemnities and no annexations. Ukraina was, in fact, treated rather favourably, and on the West, the boundaries of the new State included a large part of the district of Kholm, which was claimed by the Poles, though not on very good grounds. The Treaty provided for the resumption of diplomatic relations, and also, of course, for the resumption of commercial relations, including the export of a considerable quantity of food-stuffs to the Central Powers. The authorities in Petrograd at first refused to recognise this Treaty, and the Treaty was, in fact, one of the prime causes of the temporary resumption of hostilities between Muscovy and Germany. Subsequently, however, the Muscovite Government were compelled to recognise the Ukrainian peace, but before this occurred, the Muscovite troops invading Ukraina had captured Kieff, with some aid from the local Bolsheviks. In order to protect the peaceful republic from the invading hordes, and doubtless also for their own ends, the German and Austro-Hungarian forces advanced into Ukraina, and with the help of the weak Ukrainian forces, they were able to clear the territory of the new State of the marauding bands of Red Guards. The Germans were at first led by General von Linsingen, but afterwards General von Eichhorn was appointed as Commander of the German troops in occupation in Ukraina. Throughout this period a certain M. Golubovitch was President of the Republic, and for some months the relations between the native Government and the occupying troops were fairly amicable.

As time went on friction began to arise between the Germans and the Ukrainians. It will be remembered that the Ukrainian Government, though not Bolshevik, was nevertheless Socialist, and hence the Kieff authorities were not in such perfect sympathy with the invaders as were the reactionary diets established in the Baltic Provinces. The Germans began to favour the interests of the middle classes and the land-owners, many of whom had lost all their property, though no doubt they were

fortunate compared to the corresponding classes in other parts of Russia. This action on the part of the Germans caused considerable friction, and outbreaks against the occupying troops occurred in Kieff and in various other places. As a result of these developments the Germans, on May 2, suddenly carried out a *coup d'état* in Kieff, and established a non-Socialist Government with General Pawlow Skoropadsky as Hetman, or President. General Skoropadsky then called upon M. Nicholas Oustemovitch to form a Cabinet, and this was duly carried out. The new Government and the Germans arrested those who had been agitating against the occupying Powers, the persons arrested even including some members of the previous Cabinet.

General Skoropadsky remained in power for about six months. The hostility towards the Germans felt by the lower classes continued to develop, and on July 31 Field-Marshal von Eichhorn was assassinated in Kieff by Socialists.

On the east the Ukrainian territory bordered upon the territory of the Don Republic, and during the earlier part of the year fighting took place along the uncertain frontier. On August 7, however, a Treaty was signed between the Ukrainian and Don Republics, by which it was agreed, among other clauses, that the towns of Rostoff and Taganrog, and the surrounding districts, should fall to the Don Republic.

During the summer there were several changes of Cabinet in Kieff, although, as already stated, General Skoropadsky remained Hetman. Finally, after the defeat of the Central Powers and the withdrawal of German troops from the occupied territories in the east, the artificial support given to General Skoropadsky's Conservative régime disappeared, and at the end of the year a Socialist Government was once more installed in power in Kieff.

SIBERIA.

The fate of the great Siberian dominion was somewhat less terrible than that of European Russia. Over the greater part of European Russia, privation, and in many places, actual starvation raged throughout the year; but in Siberia, with its much more sparse population, and relatively much greater food supplies, the situation was much less acute. It was chiefly owing to this less miserable state of affairs that Bolshevism never gained the same hold on the people of Siberia as upon the people of Muscovy. Conditions in Siberia were, however, quite sufficiently anarchic. There were a number of bodies in the dominion which called themselves Siberian Governments, of which Councils at Omsk, Tomsk, and Vladivostock were the more important, but none of these bodies was able to govern more than a very limited area, and most of them could not effectively police even their own immediate districts. The country, therefore, in practice possessed no Government, and

like European Russia it was tending to fall to pieces; but the people were not afflicted with the same orgy of destruction and assassination which occurred in Muscovy. In December, 1917, an independent Republic of Siberia was proclaimed in Tomsk, the Tomsk Council severing the connexion with Petrograd. The Tomsk Council was Extreme Socialist, but had fallen out with the Bolsheviks of Muscovy. This was one of the most important "Governments" in Siberia.

Though the mass of the population in Siberia does not appear to have been Bolshevik, there was a sufficient number of these Extremists to create trouble; and in addition to the Bolsheviks themselves, there were 150,000 German and Austro-Hungarian prisoners in Siberia, who united with them. The majority of the German prisoners were in Eastern Siberia, east of Lake Baikal. Many of the prisoners and Bolsheviks were fairly well armed. At first the only organised resistance to the Bolsheviks in Eastern Siberia was that of a small Russian force under General Semenov. It was the presence of this large body of unruly men which caused the Japanese Government to advocate intervention on the part of the Entente in Siberia. It was reported that Japanese Marines were landed at Vladivostok as early as January, and at the beginning of April three Japanese subjects were killed at that port. Hence, on April 6, a small Japanese force, under the command of Admiral Cato, was landed, with the assent of the allies of Japan. A few British Marines were landed at the same time.

Shortly after this landing the situation in Siberia improved by the appearance upon the scene of a large number of Czecho-Slovak soldiers. These Czecho-Slovaks were Austro-Hungarian subjects who had been taken prisoners by the Russians early in the war, and had afterwards fought bravely for the Russian cause. After the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was signed, the Czecho-Slovak divisions, of which there appear to have been several, made their way eastwards with the intention of reaching Vladivostok, and thereafter being shipped away, in order to continue the war against the Central Powers. The long journey of these Czecho-Slovak divisions does not seem to have been opposed by the Central Bolshevik authorities, but in many places they were obliged to fight with local Bolshevik bands and with the escaped prisoners of war. The Czecho-Slovaks were, however, real soldiers, and they soon made their presence felt as a support for all the anti-Bolshevik forces. The Czecho-Slovaks began to arrive at Vladivostok early in the summer, and in June another Moderate force came into existence along the eastern Manchurian Border under the command of Admiral Koltchak. The chief part in the extraordinarily complex situation continued to be played, however, by the Czecho-Slovaks, who not only supported General Semenov and Admiral Koltchak in the east, but also obtained control of a large part of the railway west of Lake Baikal. In consequence of this, a new

Siberian Government came into existence at Omsk in July and endeavoured to rally all the anti-Bolshevik forces. And at about the same time a Provisional Government of Siberia was established at Vladivostock with the consent and support of the Allies. Yet another Siberian "Government" was formed at Grodekovo under the presidency of General Horvath. Throughout the summer the Czecho-Slovaks were engaged in fighting the Bolsheviks at various spots from Samara in the west, to Vladivostock in the east, the sundry Czecho-Slovak forces being under the command of the Russian Commander, General Diterichs. In August the Japanese force at Vladivostock was strengthened, and small contingents of the other Entente Powers, including a small British force, were landed to support the Japanese and Czechs. The enemy, on their side, however, made considerable efforts, and the important town of Irkutsk was recaptured by them in July after having been lost to the Czecho-Slovaks. On August 16, however, Irkutsk was again captured by the Czecho-Slovaks. In the meantime the Japanese force advanced, and on September 5 they captured the large town of Khabarovsk, which lies about 400 miles north of Vladivostock. One hundred and twenty Bolshevik guns were captured. On September 18 the town of Blagovestchensk was occupied by the advanced forces of Japanese cavalry. Two thousand Austro-German troops were captured in this operation. After these victories the whole Bolshevik defence of Eastern Siberia collapsed, and in the middle of October the Allied forces, including a British contingent, passed Lake Baikal and reached Irkutsk.

Whilst the war against the Bolsheviks was prospering, the political situation continued to be extremely confused. Even in the town of Omsk alone there were two "Governments." There also existed a Council at Ufa, a town which, although it lay across the border, in European Russia, was not under the control of the Bolsheviks. This Ufa Council arrogated to itself the name of the "All-Russian Government," and at the beginning of November one of the Siberian Governments at Omsk agreed to recognise the claim of the Ufa Council to rule All-Russia. The other Omsk Government had previously been in agreement with the Ufa Council. A joint Ministry was then formed with Admiral Koltchak at its head. A few weeks later the powers of the other Ministers were reduced, and Admiral Koltchak became for all practical purposes Dictator of Siberia, and he claimed to be Dictator of All-Russia.

POLAND.

It will be remembered that in November, 1916, the two Kaisers had issued proclamations establishing an independent or semi-independent Polish State. The new State was to include part of the territory of what had been Russian Poland,

and it was apparently contemplated later that Austria should cede Galicia to independent Poland, but there was no thought of surrendering the Prussian Polish districts to the Polish nation. The Poland which was thus to be established may be compared to Napoleon's "Grand Duchy of Warsaw," though, if it included Galicia, the new Poland would be a better resuscitation of the Poland of history than was Napoleon's creation. It was contemplated by the Central Powers that the new Poland should be a monarchy; and a Regency Council was established in September, 1917. The Regency Council consisted of the Archbishop of Warsaw (Monseigneur A. von Kakowski), the Mayor of Warsaw (Prince Lubomirski), and M. Josef von Ostrowski. Apart from the Regency Council, a definite Polish Cabinet was established, although this body, owing to the occupation of the country by the Austro-German armies, possessed but limited powers. At the end of 1917 M. Jan Kucharzewski was Prime Minister.

During the earlier part of the year little reliable news from Poland reached Western Europe, but a State Diet, mainly unrepresentative, was established. In the spring there was a change of Government, M. Steczkowski becoming the Prime Minister. The German and Austro-Hungarian Governments became extremely unpopular in Poland at the time of the Treaty of Peace with Ukrainia, since the inclusion of the Kholm district in Ukrainia was considered to be a great injury to the Poles. It was this event which caused M. Kucharzewski to resign, and there was no settled Cabinet until some weeks later when, at the beginning of April, as already stated, a new Cabinet was appointed. By this time the Germans had made it clear that there was to be a revision of the Ukrainian Treaty in respect of the Kholm district, part of the district being given back to Poland.

At the beginning of November, when the resistance of the Central Powers broke down, the Polish people asserted themselves in good earnest. On November 6 a Polish People's Republic was proclaimed in Cracow, and within a few days a Socialist Government was brought into existence under the presidency of M. Dazynski. As soon as the Central Powers were disarmed, the Poles proceeded to invade all the districts which they deemed rightfully to belong to them. Western Galicia they seized at once, and they then proceeded to advance into Eastern Galicia, where, however, they met with vigorous resistance from the Ukrainians. On November 23 the Poles established themselves in Lemberg. Similar events occurred in Prussian Poland. The town of Posen was taken over by the Polish authorities as early as November 17, and the Polish bands proceeded to occupy all the Polish-speaking districts of what had been the German Empire.

Unfortunately, the Polish occupation of Lemberg was marred by a serious pogrom against the Jews.

FINLAND.

Immediately after the Russian Revolution, Finland became virtually independent of the Russian State. The Russian Government under Prince Lvoff, and under M. Kerensky, refused to acknowledge the absolute independence of Finland, but they took no steps in the direction of forcibly coercing the little country. The Bolsheviks, when they obtained power, acknowledged, in theory, the independence of Finland, but in practice they immediately set to work to interfere in Finland's internal affairs, and attempted to coerce, in their usual bloody manner, the Finnish people.

Tsarist Russia had never suppressed altogether the Finnish Diet, but in October, 1917, it was deemed desirable to hold fresh elections for this body. In these elections the combined non-Socialist Parties obtained a small majority. At the end of 1917 the country was recognised as independent by the French and Swedish Governments, and early in 1918 the Danish and Norse Cabinets took the same action. As early as January, however, serious trouble broke out in the country. This was due almost exclusively to the interference of Russian Bolsheviks. As already stated, the non-Socialist Parties possessed a majority in Finland, and of the Socialists, many were much too moderate to be styled Bolsheviks. Nevertheless, a party of Finnish Bolsheviks did exist. The Finnish Bolsheviks were almost as troublesome as their Russian counterparts, and before the end of January, with the help of bands of Red Guards from across the Russian border, a general Bolshevik revolt broke out, and became so serious that it developed into actual civil war. The Government called up a Militia, who were termed "White Guards," and the Government, which was under the leadership of Senator Svinkufvud, decided to send an appeal to the Swedish Government for armed assistance. The Liberal-Socialist Government in Sweden refused to give any assistance, notwithstanding the historic connexion between the two countries. And King Gustav's Ministry even refused to allow the Finnish Whites (who included all respectable elements of society) to purchase arms in Sweden. Owing to this action on the part of Sweden, and owing to the support given to the Finnish Red Guards by the Russian intruders, the war at first developed very adversely for the White Party. The White Guards were at first unable to obtain sufficient arms with which to oppose the artillery and rifles supplied to the Reds by the Russians, and consequently Helsingfors and all the south of Finland came temporarily under the control of the Bolsheviks. M. Svinkufvud and General Mannerheim (the Commander of the Finnish Army) sent warnings to Stockholm that if there was no effective Swedish assistance, the Finnish Government would be obliged to apply elsewhere for help. Nevertheless, Mr. Eden refused to act, save in regard to the Aaland Islands, and his lack of energy

was severely criticised by Swedish Conservatives. Many individual Swedish volunteers joined the Finnish Army. The Finnish Government were compelled, however, to apply to Germany for assistance, and to their satisfaction that assistance was immediately forthcoming. Arms were sent, and on April 2, 40,000 German troops with 300 guns were landed at Hangö. German troops were also sent to the Aaland Islands. And within a few days the Finnish Bolshevik "Government" were compelled to evacuate Helsingfors, the capital being occupied by the Germans on April 14. At the beginning of May the Swedish Government withdrew their troops from the Aalands.

The intervention of Germany in Finland, and the consequent defeat of the Bolsheviks, had an effect upon Finnish policy. Up to that time the Finns, both Whites and of course the Reds, were almost exclusively republican in sentiment. The White Party, in fact, included nearly half the Socialist Party in the Diet. German influence naturally caused the Whites to become more Conservative, however, and the idea of a Finnish monarchy was mooted as early as May. It was at first proposed that Duke Frederick Francis IV. of Mecklenburg-Schwerin should become King. The question, however, was constantly postponed throughout the summer, and it was not until October that the Finnish Diet elected a King in the person of Prince Frederick Karl of Hesse. The Prince was the German Emperor's brother-in-law. The election of a German Prince as King of Finland caused France to sever relations with the Finnish Government. The Prince did not proceed to the country, and after the defeat of Germany, the election of Prince Frederick Karl was allowed to lapse, and the whole question of the Finnish monarchy was held in abeyance.

Throughout this period M. Svinkufvud remained at the head of the Finnish Executive. He was at first known as President of Finland, but when, after the German invasion, the dominant Party became monarchical, he took the title of Regent. Before the end of November M. Svinkufvud expressed his desire to resign, however, and it was proposed that General Mannerheim should become his successor. On December 11 General Mannerheim was elected head of the State by a large majority of the Diet in Helsingfors.

THE OTHER RUSSIAN STATES.

A considerable number of other States of minor importance were formed on the corpse of the Tsar's Empire.

After the occupation of the Lithuanian country by the Germans, it was announced that a Lithuanian State would be formed, with its capital at Vilna. It was understood that the State would be a monarchy, and the independence of the country was formally proclaimed by the Vilna Diet in February. The Diet appears to have shown some independence, and in July it

was reported that the Diet, without consulting the German Government, had elected Duke William of Urach as King of Lithuania. After the defeat of the Central Powers there was here, as elsewhere, a reaction in favour of democracy, and at the end of November a Lithuanian Republic was proclaimed, this time at Riga, and it was stated that a certain Herr Karl Ullman had been elected President. The new Lithuanian Republic proceeded at once to make territorial claims, more particularly in Courland and East Prussia. It was claimed that Libau, Insterburg, and Goldap ought to belong to the Lithuanian State.

The position in the Baltic Provinces was somewhat involved. According to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, Esthonia and Livonia occupied quite a different position in regard to Germany from that held by Riga and Courland. Esthonia and Livonia were supposed to be independent. Courland was not even legally independent, but was, even according to the letter of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, to be formally associated with Germany. The schism was, however, somewhat artificial, for the Baltic Provinces possessed a certain real unity. The Germans had, of course, occupied Courland during the war with Russia, and after the interruption of the armistice with Russia, they advanced rapidly into Esthonia and Livonia, and not altogether without a legitimate excuse, for the Bolshevik Red Guards were murdering and thieving all over the country-side. In all three provinces, Diets were established on a rigid class basis, representing almost exclusively the German nobility. The Courland Diet offered the Throne of the Duchy to the German Emperor, and a few weeks later, in April, a deputation from Livonia and Esthonia asked for the establishment of a single Diet for all the Baltic Provinces, and asked that all the Baltic Provinces might be then brought into close association with the German Empire. These overtures were naturally received favourably by the German Government, but the whole arrangement was, of course, temporary. The immediate result of the defeat of the Central Powers cannot be said to have been happy in the Baltic Provinces. Esthonia and Livonia, so soon as the German troops were withdrawn, were invaded by new swarms of Muscovite Bolsheviks, who began once more to murder all the respectable elements of the population. Before the end of November the Muscovite hordes had reached as far as Dünaburg. The Bolsheviks were opposed, but not effectually, both by the German nobility and by all the better elements in the Lettish population. A British Fleet hastened to Reval at all speed and occupied that port early in December. But the British force was not sufficiently powerful to check the advance of the Russians inland, and at the end of the year the Bolsheviks were still making their way westwards and laying waste the land far and wide.

Among the other minor Russian States formed was a Cossack Republic in the Don Province, a Republic of Turkestan,

a Republic in the Crimea, and a federation of small Republics in the Caucasus.

TURKEY.

The beginning of the year found Turkey still under the dominion of Taalat Pasha as Grand Vizier, and Enver Pasha, as Minister of War; and up to this time the events of the war had not seriously shaken the position of these two forcible pro-German Ministers. Up to the time of the victory over the Bulgarians the year was not very eventful in Turkey. The Russian collapse had eased the Turkish military situation in various directions, and it was not until the autumn that serious advances were made by the two British armies invading the Ottoman Empire, namely, that under General Marshall in Mesopotamia, and that under General Allenby, which had advanced from Egypt into Palestine. On their side, the Turks were able to advance in the Caucasus, and also in the direction of Persia, during the earlier months of the year. They retook Erzerum in March, and, as stated elsewhere, the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk assigned to Turkey the districts of Kars, Ardahan, and Batoum.

The operations in Mesopotamia were less striking than in previous years, when Kut and Baghdad were taken. At the beginning of April, General Marshall struck a blow at the Turks stationed at Khan Baghdadie, beyond Hit. The local Turkish force was surrounded, and 5,000 prisoners were taken. This blow was followed by a rapid cavalry march, General Marshall's troops advancing 130 miles in a week. About four weeks later the advance was continued towards Mosul, and Kifri was taken. On May 7 Kirkuk was taken. Later in the summer General Marshall threw out a small force up to the region of the Caspian, which was then being threatened by the Turks, but the latter were in strength in this district, and this wing of General Marshall's force was subsequently compelled to retire. In the general breakdown of the Ottoman resistance at the end of October, General Marshall added his blows to those directed from other directions, but he was not able to reach Mosul before the conclusion of the armistice.

An account of the operations in Palestine will be found in the article on Egypt.

On July 3 Sultan Mohammed V. died (see Obituary, p. 183). The Sultan had held the throne since April 27, 1909, and he had been throughout his reign a mere tool in the hands of the so-called "Committee of Union and Progress." He was succeeded by his brother, Prince Vahid-ed-Din.

After the capitulation of Bulgaria, it became apparent to the authorities in Constantinople that the war was lost, and the only reason causing the Turks to delay some weeks in making peace, was that they hoped to gain some advantages by making

peace in common with Germany and Austria-Hungary. It was only natural that the loss of the war should cause a change of Government in Turkey. In the middle of October, Taalat and Enver resigned; and after Twfik Pasha had unsuccessfully attempted to form a Ministry, Izzet Pasha became Grand Vizier. Djavid Bey became Minister of Finance. The new Cabinet immediately entered into negotiations for an armistice, and it is interesting to record that they utilised General Townshend (the hero of Kut) as the intermediary in the preliminary negotiations. The negotiations were of very brief duration, and Vice-Admiral Calthorpe acted on behalf of the Allied Powers. The armistice was signed at Mudros on October 30, and came into operation on the following day. The terms of the armistice, which provided for the opening of the Dardanelles and the occupation of the Bosphorus forts, will be found in full elsewhere (see Public Documents, p. 149). Vice-Admiral Calthorpe was appointed British Commissioner at Constantinople. Later in November Twfik Pasha succeeded Izzet as Grand Vizier, and formed a Government from which all members of the Committee of Union and Progress were entirely excluded.

On November 20 the British Government published an official report on the treatment of British prisoners of war in Turkey. About 16,500 British and Indian officers and men were captured by the Turks, and of these, 3,290 had been reported as dead, and 2,222 were untraced. Of 2,680 British N.C.O.'s and privates taken in Kut, 1,306 were reported dead, and 449 were untraced. These figures speak for themselves. The prisoners, not only the rank and file, but in many cases the officers too, were treated with incredible barbarity, and were sent upon marches under such conditions that a large percentage died from their sufferings.

RUMANIA.

Owing to the conclusion of the armistice by the Bolshevik Government of Russia, Rumania was placed in a difficult, and, indeed, hopeless situation. And before the end of the year 1917, the Rumanian Government, being at the mercy of the Central Powers, also concluded an armistice with the enemy. It will be remembered that since the end of 1916 a large part of the country, including all the Dobrudja and the greater part of Wallachia, with Bucharest, had been occupied by the Central Powers. The Rumanian Government was established at Jassy, M. Bratiano still being at the head of the Cabinet at the end of 1917. A singular incident occurred in January. The new Russian Government, through the medium of the Russian troops who were in Moldavia, supposedly for the defence of that country, endeavoured to stir up a Bolshevik revolution against King Ferdinand's Government. When the Rumanian authorities took steps to suppress the Russian agitators, the Bolshevik Government took umbrage, and after a short dispute the

Russian Government actually declared war upon Rumania at the end of January. There was considerable fighting along the frontier, but owing to the renewal of hostilities between Muscovy and Germany, the Red Guards were unable to interfere seriously in Rumania and peace was subsequently concluded. The Rumanians were, however, compelled to enter into negotiations with the Central Powers, and in February there was accordingly a change of Government at Jassy, General Avarescu becoming the Prime Minister in order to carry on the negotiations with the Central Powers. Negotiations were carried on in Bucharest, and a so-called Treaty of Bucharest was signed there on May 7. In view of the subsequent defeat of the Central Powers, the Treaty possesses of course only historic interest. The full terms of the Treaty were published at the beginning of May. The Dobrudja was to be ceded to Bulgaria, though Rumania was to retain rights of commercial communication with Constanza. The Rumanian Army was to be demobilised, and the force to be subsequently maintained was of an extremely limited character. Along the Rumanian side of the Carpathians a strip of territory was to be ceded to Hungary, giving to the Dual Monarchy the strategic points at the Rumanian openings of the Carpathian passes. The Treaty also gave the Central States important economic rights in Rumania. It was apparently only the southern part of the Dobrudja that was to be ceded immediately to Bulgaria; the northern part of the Dobrudja was to be occupied by the Central Powers collectively as a temporary arrangement.

In the middle of March General Avarescu resigned, and M. Marghiloman, the well-known pro-German, became Prime Minister. During the spring the chief interest attached to the question of Bessarabia. On April 9 a Bessarabian National Assembly voted for union with Rumania by 86 votes to 3, and a few weeks later the annexation of Bessarabia by Rumania was sanctioned by the German and Austro-Hungarian Governments.

In June a General Election was held in Rumania, but it was held under such circumstances that the results could not be regarded as giving any indication of the feeling of the country.

When it became apparent that Germany was defeated, the Rumanian authorities decided to throw off the yoke. M. Marghiloman resigned, and General Coanda became Prime Minister, and on November 10 Rumania declared war upon Germany. Since, however, the armistice was concluded within a few hours, no hostilities broke out in Rumania. According to the terms of the armistice with the Western Powers, the German troops were compelled to evacuate Rumania, and the King and the Government returned to Bucharest. The King and Queen made their formal entry into their Capital on December 1. After the revolutions in the Dual Monarchy, the Rumanians of Transylvania declared their desire, through a National Assembly

sitting at Sibiu (Hermannstadt), to be united with the Kingdom of Rumania. At the end of the year M. Bratiano was again in power, and it was expected that a great Rumanian State would be formed, including Wallachia, Moldavia, the Dobrudja, Bessarabia, Transylvania, and possibly part of Bukovina.

BULGARIA.

At the beginning of the year Bulgaria appeared to be entirely under the control of Germany, but before long it became apparent that the country did, in fact, retain considerable independence. Throughout the war M. Radoslavoff had been at the head of King Ferdinand's Government, and he was of course notoriously pro-German. It was therefore significant when, in June, M. Radoslavoff resigned, and was succeeded by M. Malinoff as Prime Minister. M. Malinoff was notoriously less favourable to Germany than M. Radoslavoff, and the question of a separate peace came to be openly discussed in the Bulgarian Press. Later in the year King Ferdinand, who was reported to be ill, left Bulgaria and resided in Germany. In the middle of September the successful offensive of the Allied Army of Salonika began, and within a few days it became clear that the Allies had at last found the weak point in the whole Central Alliance. At the end of September, as described elsewhere (see p. [37], the Bulgarian Army completely collapsed, and M. Malinoff applied to General D'Esperey for an armistice. The armistice was granted on severe terms, of which the following were the most important:—

"1. Immediate evacuation of the territories still occupied by Bulgarians in Greece and Serbia; no cattle, cereals, or provisions to be exported from such territories, which must be left undamaged; the Bulgarian civil administration to continue in the parts of North Bulgaria occupied by the Allies.

"2. Immediate demobilisation.

"3. Surrender of arms, munitions, and vehicles, which are to be stored under the control of the Allies, and of horses, which are to be handed over to the Allies.

"4. Restitution to Greece of the material of the Fourth Army Corps taken when the Bulgarians occupied Eastern Macedonia.

"5. The elements of Bulgarian troops to the north and west of Uskub belonging to the Eleventh German Army to lay down their arms; they will be treated as prisoners of war and the officers will be allowed to keep their swords.

"6. Bulgarian prisoners in the East shall be employed by the Allies until the peace, while the Allied prisoners in Bulgaria are to be immediately released."

It was also provided that Bulgarian territory should be available for the Allied operations against Austria-Hungary. It was, however, conceded that the occupation of Bulgaria should

be carried out by French and British troops, not by Serbians or Greeks, a point which was of some importance, having regard to the savage antipathies existing in the Balkans.

King Ferdinand abdicated and retired to Germany, and the Crown Prince Boris became King. The new King issued a manifesto stating that he would govern as a strictly constitutional monarch. His position on the throne, however, did not go uncontested, for early in November it was reported that he had abdicated, and that a so-called Peasants' Government had been established at Tirnovo. This movement failed to gain support, however, and the young King's abdication was therefore withdrawn. At the end of November a new Cabinet was formed, with M. Todoroff as Premier and Minister for Foreign Affairs.

GREECE.

At the beginning of the year the Hellenic Kingdom had taken up a firm position as one of the Entente group of Powers. It will be remembered that the pro-German sovereign, King Constantine, had abdicated under pressure from France and Great Britain in the previous June, and that his second son Alexander had become King. The young King had been willing to associate himself with France and Great Britain, a course of action which had always been desired by the majority of the Greek nation, and accordingly the famous pro-Entente statesman, M. Venizelos, had become Prime Minister under the new sovereign. The year 1918 was less eventful. A Greek army joined the other Allies on the Macedonian front, and at the end of May an offensive operation was undertaken, in which the main responsibility fell upon the Greek contingent. On May 30 the Greeks attacked strong fortified positions at Skra di Legen, about 10 miles west of the Vardar, and succeeded in reaching all their objectives, and capturing in two days nearly 2,000 prisoners. In the spring a Bill was passed by the Legislature, giving the ex-King Constantine an annual grant of 500,000 drachmæ, but at the same time King Alexander's Civil List was reduced from 2,000,000 drachmæ to 1,600,000 drachmæ. After the conclusion of the armistices, the attention of the Greek nation was mainly concentrated upon the question of attaining that real national unity for which they had so long yearned. The Hellenes claimed to be united with their brethren in Asia Minor, in the Dodekanesos, and even in Cyprus and Southern Albania. The question of the Dodekanese was apparently deemed the most vital to Greece. These islands had been captured from Turkey by Italy in the previous Turko-Italian war, and had since been occupied by the Italians. But the Greeks claimed, not without reason, that according to the principle of nationalities the Dodekanesos should rightfully form a part of the Greek kingdom. It was pointed out that of a total popula-

tion of less than 120,000 over 102,000 were Greeks. The position in Southern Albania, or Epirus, was more disputable.

SERBIA.

The year 1918 witnessed a dramatic rehabilitation of Serbia's fortunes. At the beginning of the year, King Peter, the Prince Regent, Alexander, and the Serbian Government were exiles in Corfu. M. Nicola Pashitch was Prime Minister. In the successful operations against Bulgaria at the end of September, the Serbian Army played a prominent part, and, as described elsewhere (see p. [37], Nish and Belgrade were soon recaptured by their rightful owners. The victory over the Central Powers having been won, it immediately became necessary to face the problems of the relations between Serbia and the other Jugo-Slav territories, now liberated from the Habsburg domination, and also between the proposed Jugo-Slav federation as a whole, and the aggrandised Italian kingdom. The problems presented many difficulties. In the first place there was room for rivalry between Serbia and the long-established Croatian State. Secondly, there was the Serbian desire to absorb her ally, Montenegro, a scheme which was much resented by many Montenegrins. And thirdly, there was the age-long antagonism between Slavs and Italians in Dalmatia to be faced, and if possible mollified.

The first of these difficulties appears to have given rise to the least friction. A provisional Jugo-Slav Government was established at Zagreb (Agram) at the time of the dissolution of Austria-Hungary, but this Government, notwithstanding its predominantly Croatian character, immediately entered into amicable relations with M. Pashitch. On the other hand, the relations between the Serbian Government and the Montenegrin Government (which remained in France) were not so happy. The most serious controversy arose, however, with Italy (see p. [182]). The Italian imperialists claimed Fiume and all Dalmatia, territories to which they had no right on the principle of nationalities. Unfortunately, however, the Treaty of London, signed between Italy and the Entente Powers at the time of the Italian intervention in the war, had assigned Northern Dalmatia to Italy, though not Fiume or Southern Dalmatia. Hence, though Italy had no right to Northern Dalmatia on the principle of nationalities (for the Italians throughout that province constituted only a minute minority of the population), she may be said to have had a good case from the point of view of treaty rights. Up to the end of the year no solution of this Italian and Jugo-Slav problem had been reached.

At the end of October M. Pashitch paid a visit to London to confer with the British Ministers.

On November 25 a Congress at Neustad proclaimed the union of the Jugo-Slav territories of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire, with Serbia and Montenegro, and this same

Congress appointed Prince Alexander as Regent of the new State, and M. Pashitch became first Prime Minister of the combined State. M. Korosek, who had been head of the Provisional Government at Zagreb, became Vice-Premier, and M. Trumbitch, President of the London Jugo-Slav Committee, became Minister for Foreign Affairs. In the middle of December, however, M. Pashitch resigned, and M. Stoyan Protitch became Prime Minister. M. Protitch had previously been Serbian Minister of Finance.

MONTENEGRO.

At the beginning of the year King Nicholas and his Government (of which M. Popovitch was Premier) were exiles in France, having been forced to flee from their own country at the end of 1915. As stated above, relations between the Serbian and Montenegrin dynasties were not satisfactory, owing to the Serbian Government's desire to annex Montenegro. After the conclusion of the armistice, King Peter and the Government, somewhat to the surprise of the onlookers, did not return to their own country. On October 26, however, the Montenegrin Government issued a Proclamation to all the Jugo-Slav peoples, referring in enthusiastic language to the victory of the Allies, and declaring that Montenegro would become a constituent State of a Jugo-Slav federation. On November 29 a Congress was stated to have been held at Podgoritza, and this Assembly appears to have passed a resolution deposing King Nicholas and his House, and uniting Montenegro with Serbia under King Peter. The Conference claimed to be a Montenegrin Skupshtina, but it possessed no satisfactory credentials and was believed to be too much under the influence of Serbian partisans. The Montenegrin Government and the Montenegrin Nationalists claimed that it would be clearly unjust to allow Serbia to absorb Montenegro until a plebiscite on the question had been taken in the smaller kingdom. The problem of the structure of the Jugo-Slav State—whether it should be a unitary State or a federation, and if a federation, how many, and what, the constituent States, should be—remained undecided at the end of the year.

ALBANIA.

Only the southern third of Albania was occupied by the Allied troops, chiefly Italians, at the beginning of the year, but after the Bulgarian defeat the whole of the principality was rapidly reconquered by the Allies. Up to the end of the year no decision regarding the fate of Albania appeared to have been taken by the Allied Powers. The Albanian Nationalists were busily advocating the claims of Albania to the Epirus, in opposition to the Greek contentions on this matter,

CHAPTER IV.

LESSER STATES OF WESTERN AND NORTHERN EUROPE: BELGIUM
— LUXEMBURG — THE NETHERLANDS — SWITZERLAND —
LIECHTENSTEIN — SPAIN—PORTUGAL—DENMARK AND ICE-
LAND—SWEDEN—NORWAY—SPITSBERGEN.

BELGIUM.

THE year 1918 witnessed the triumph of justice in Belgium. At the beginning of the year King Albert's Government was still exiled from the country, the whole of which, except for the little district around Ypres, was suffering under the occupation of the German troops. The Government was enjoying the hospitality of the French Republic at Le Havre, where it had been throughout the war.

At the end of January the Government published King Albert's Reply to the Pope's Peace Note, the reply being dated December 24, 1917. The King stated that nobody could doubt the right of Belgium to say that she had taken up arms to defend her existence. Belgium could only accept a peace which gave her reparation. "The integrity of Belgian territory, both home and colonial, political independence, both economic and military, without condition or restriction; reparation for the damage done; guarantees against a renewal of the 1914 aggression—these remain the indispensable conditions of a just peace so far as Belgium is concerned."

Little can be said of the last period of the German occupation of Belgium. The Germans endeavoured, however, to accentuate their division of the country into a Flemish district and a Walloon district. Early in the year so-called elections took place for a "Council of Flanders," but the council was, in fact, entirely unrepresentative. There is every reason to suppose that only a small minority of the Flemish people supported these schemes.

On September 14 the German Government made a definite proposal of peace to the Ministry at Le Havre. The German Government offered to restore the political and economic independence of Belgium. The Germans asked, however, that their pre-war commercial treaties with Belgium should be perpetuated, and that Belgium should use her influence in favour of the restoration of the German colonies, and finally, they demanded that the Belgian kingdom, having been evacuated, should resume its former neutrality—namely, that the territory should not be used to facilitate any invasion of Germany. This offer was promptly refused by King Albert's Government.

During October and November, when the Belgian Army was reconquering its country, the troops were received with indescribable enthusiasm in the towns and in the country-side. The King and Queen made their formal entry into Brussels on

November 22. The King entered the capital by the *Porte de Flandre*, and then, leaving his motor car, and mounting his horse, he rode down the *Rue de Flandre*, through various streets to the *Boulevard Anspach*, and then to the *Rue Royale* and on to the *Place de la Nation*, where a review of troops of the Allied nations, including the British, was held. The King then proceeded to the Parliament House and delivered a long speech. He first gave details of the part played by the Belgian Army, and then referred in a laudatory manner to the assistance given by his great Allies. He stated that a new Government had been formed, and expressed the hope that the national unity would be made even firmer than formerly by the trials of the war. The Government would bring in a Bill for establishing the strictest linguistic equality between Flemings and Walloons. The King then referred to the foreign relations of Belgium. He said that she was now emancipated from neutrality. He next mentioned the Congo, and said that Belgium would develop her great colony. The King ended with a eulogy of the friendship between Belgium and her great Allies.

The new Government referred to by the King was a remarkable coalition of Clericals, Liberals, and Socialists. M. Delacroix, a Clerical, was Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, and M. Hymans, a Liberal, was Minister for Foreign Affairs. M. Vandeveld, the famous Socialist, was Minister for Justice.

At the end of the year considerable interest was aroused by the claims which the Belgian Government proposed to make at the Peace Conference. According to the Foreign Minister, the Government would ask for a revision of the Treaty of 1839. It was apparently proposed to ask for an amendment of the provision which gave the Netherlands absolute control of the Lower Scheldt, and it was even proposed to ask for the annexation to Belgium of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, and of Dutch Limburg. Certain organs of the Belgian Press were also asking for the annexation of the part of Zeeland lying to the south of the Scheldt. The idea of a revision of the laws governing navigation in the Scheldt was deemed reasonable by most impartial judges, but most foreigners thought the territorial claims excessive, particularly the claims to Dutch territory. One of the grievances which the Belgians urged against the Dutch was that after the armistice the Dutch had permitted German troops to retire to the Rhine across the southern extremity of Dutch Limburg.

LUXEMBURG.

The year was somewhat eventful in Luxemburg, and witnessed, of course, the liberation of the little country from the troops of the German Empire. Herr Kauffmann was at the head of the Grand Duchess's Government. A General Election

was held at the end of July, which was of more than ordinary importance, for it was expected that the new Parliament would undertake the work of revising the constitution of the Grand Duchy. The result of the elections was that twenty-three members of the Conservative-Clerical Coalition were returned, thirteen Liberals, twelve Socialists, and five Independents.

At the end of August it was announced that Princess Antoinette, the Grand Duchess's third sister, who was only eighteen years of age, had become betrothed to Prince Rupert of Bavaria.

After the conclusion of the armistice the American troops were received with great enthusiasm in the city of Luxemburg.

In the middle of November a resolution was passed by the Legislature asking for a referendum to be taken on the future form of the government of the country, and requesting the Grand Duchess to abstain from political acts until after that referendum had been taken. The Grand Duchess announced her intention to comply with this resolution of her Parliament.

THE NETHERLANDS.

It may be said with truth that the one object which the Dutch Government had held in view during the European War was to keep their country outside the conflict. And thus it was that the year 1918 brought the crowning success to this policy of caution. For the conclusion of the armistice in November found Holland still neutral, and still, notwithstanding many occasions for friction, on correct diplomatic terms with all the belligerent Powers. The Dutch Government had come into constant diplomatic conflict with both groups of belligerents, but through the exercise of most astute moderation the Cabinet had succeeded in avoiding any open rupture. It is strange that we have to record here that the most serious divergence between Dutch interests and those of neighbouring Powers arose, not during the hostilities, but after the conclusion of the armistice.

At the beginning of the year negotiations, beset with unavoidable difficulties, took place between the Dutch Government on the one side, and America and the Allies on the other side, in regard to the use by the Associated Powers of Dutch ships lying in American and Allied ports. According to statements made in Washington in January, it appears that the Dutch Government were very willing to allow Dutch ships to be chartered by the Associated Powers, provided the vessels were not sent into the so-called "barred zone" marked out by the German Admiralty. The Dutch were the more willing to allow this acquisition of tonnage by the Associated Powers, because in return the Powers offered to send considerable quantities of food-stuffs into Dutch ports, and Holland, like the other North-European neutrals, had experienced for many months great

difficulty in obtaining a sufficiency of food. The difference of opinion arose, however, when the Associated Powers demanded that the vessels in question should be utilised within the barred zone. It was proposed that no less than 600,000 tons of Dutch shipping should be taken over by the Associated Powers, 150,000 tons being utilised in the interests of the relief of distress in Belgium, and the remainder being used for the general purposes of the Associated Powers. The Dutch Government delayed the ratification of the original agreement (which stipulated that the ships should not be sent within the barred zone), and whether for this, as was stated, or for some other reason, the Associated Powers then raised their demand in respect of the use of the ships within the barred zone. On March 12 Jonkheer Loudon, the Foreign Minister, presented a memorandum to both Houses of Parliament on the course of these negotiations. The Minister explained that the Dutch Government were not necessarily under any obligation to ratify the preliminary agreement which had been concluded in London. And in fact they could not do so without consulting the German Government, since the agreement had stipulated for the restriction of certain exports to Germany from Holland. Jonkheer Loudon further stated that the Cabinet had endeavoured to secure a supply of 100,000 tons of wheat from the United States pending the conclusion of an agreement, but this the American Government had refused. In a further speech to the Lower House on March 18, the Foreign Minister said that the Government were on the point of ratifying the original agreement "when suddenly the Associated Governments made a demand that the tonnage in question should also navigate in the danger zone." Throughout the discussion, said M. Loudon, the Dutch Government had made the principle of navigation outside the danger zone only, a condition of the agreement. Furthermore, the Dutch Government could not accept the opinion now being propagated in some quarters, that international law allowed a belligerent actually to requisition neutral ships lying in his harbours. On the contrary, international law, he said, only recognises such a procedure in certain exceptional circumstances, namely, "where the attainment of some immediately necessary strategic aim is in question." In the latter part of his speech the Minister announced that the German Government would be unable to deliver the 100,000 tons of wheat for which the Dutch Government had asked.

At the end of the discussion the Dutch Government seem to have been inclined to agree to the navigation of the ships within the danger zone, provided that they carried no troops and no war material, and that they should not be armed, and that any ships destroyed should be replaced immediately after the war; but within a few days, on March 20, the whole controversy was brought to a sudden end by the requisitioning of the Dutch ships by the Associated Governments. The British

and American Governments contended that the requisitioning of neutral ships in this manner was an immemorial right allowed by international law. The Netherlands Government protested vigorously against this action.

The concessions which the Netherlands Government were thus compelled to make to the Allies was used as a pretext by the German Government to bring pressure to bear in order to obtain concessions in another direction. Even before the end of 1917 much controversy with Great Britain had arisen, owing to the fact that the Netherlands had permitted the use of the railways across Limburg for the transport of materials, particularly sand and gravel, from Germany to Belgium. At the beginning of 1918 the Dutch Government restricted these facilities, but in April they were again compelled to afford the German Government the highly advantageous right of using these railways across Limburg, the only proviso being the necessarily unpractical qualification that the railways should not be used for traffic of a military character.

Throughout the year, as for some time previously, the Dutch nation were compelled to adopt a severe measure of food rationing; and it was their unfortunate geographical situation in regard to this matter which enabled their greater neighbours, belonging to both groups, to bring pressure to bear upon the Dutch Government. How severe the food stringency really was may be realised from a curious incident which occurred. In April Karl Hagenbeck's famous Circus from Hamburg arrived in the country, and this caused quite a serious agitation against the authorities, for it was contended that in the existing conditions the necessary food for the animals could not be spared.

Partly owing to the severe conditions of life, and partly through the influence of events in the other countries of Europe, the extreme Socialists were active during the year. The extremists were not numerous but they attracted much public attention. A small group, numbering altogether only about 1,000 formal members, and known as the Social Democratic Party, had now adopted Bolshevik principles. This section had been in existence for about eight years. There was also a small but active group of anarchists who published several papers. Apart from these extremists there was a much larger and somewhat less violent party, called the Social Democratic Workers Party, which boasted 25,000 members and held fifteen seats in the Lower House. These combined extremists proclaimed a general strike at the beginning of February, but they obtained little support from the lower classes as a whole, and the strike ceased within a few days.

The question of the draining of the Zuyder Zee, which had been discussed for years, was brought to a practical issue at the beginning of the year. A Government Bill was introduced into Parliament, and after prolonged debates was finally passed through both Houses in June.

In the spring the Government announced that they proposed to send a large convoy of vessels to the Dutch East Indies, carrying state passengers and goods. And on May 31, the Dutch Press was authorised to explain that the Commander of the convoy would be ordered to refuse all belligerents the right of search. This announcement naturally caused a renewal of controversy with Great Britain; but after much discussion, and after the Government had given Great Britain information in regard to the convoy, the British Government announced that they would not, in this one instance, insist upon the right of search; and the convoy sailed on July 4.

During the summer the Dutch Government gave the hospitality of the Hague to an Anglo-German Conference on the question of the exchange of prisoners of war. The Conference was opened on June 9 by Jonkheer Loudon. The Chairman of the British delegation was Sir George Cave, and the Chairman of the German delegation was General Friedrich. A tentative agreement was reached, but the German Government delayed to ratify the agreement, owing, apparently, to their desire to cause Great Britain to bring pressure upon the Chinese Government to improve the treatment of Germans in China. After a prolonged discussion a compromise on this point was reached, and the German Government ratified the agreement at the beginning of November. But within a few days the agreement was of course superseded by the terms of the armistice imposed upon Germany.

The chief political event of the year was the General Election, which was held on July 3. This was even more interesting than usual, owing to the fact that since the previous General Election the Suffrage had been extended and Proportional Representation had been introduced. The election campaigns of the different parties lasted about six weeks and were carried on with great enthusiasm. On the day of the elections it was announced that the Prime Minister, Jonkheer van der Linden, had tendered to the Queen the resignation of the Cabinet. The elections, which were fought entirely on domestic issues, not on foreign policy, resulted in numerous successes for the Catholics and Conservatives, who obtained a small majority in the Lower House. The Liberals lost many seats but a strong Labour Party was returned. An anomaly of the election was that although women were not entitled to vote, they were permitted to stand as candidates, and one well-known woman Socialist, Vrou Suze Groeneweg, was elected.

The results of the elections led to such political difficulties that it was not until two months had elapsed that a Cabinet was finally formed. The names of Mgr. W. H. Nolens, Mr. Idenburg, and Mr. Colyn were mentioned as those of possible Premiers, but a Cabinet was finally formed at the beginning of September by Mr. Ruys de Beerenbrouck, who himself took the portfolio of the Home Office. The Foreign Office went to Dr. van Karne-

beek, and Mr. de Vries became Finance Minister. Mr. Idenburg became Minister for the Colonies, and Vice-Admiral Naudin Ten Cate went to the Admiralty. Mr. de Beerenbrouck, the leader of the Roman Catholic Party, was only forty-four years of age, and had represented one of the Limburg constituencies in the Lower House for the previous fourteen years. The new Premier had discreetly refrained from offering any opinions upon the war. Mr. Idenburg was leader of the Conservative, or Anti-Revolutionary, Party. Mr. van Karnebeek had been Burgomaster of the Hague, but was not well known in connexion with foreign politics.

Parliament was opened on September 17, and in her Speech from the Throne the Queen said that her Government would continue to pursue scrupulously a policy of neutrality, but would remain at the same time prepared to defend the rights of the Netherlands. The work of draining the Zuyder Zee would be pressed forward energetically, in accordance with the terms of the new Act, and legislation would be introduced to suppress the traffic in opium.

After the conclusion of the armistice the Dutch Government permitted the retreating German troops to pass through the southern extremity of Dutch Limburg. The Associated Powers sent protests to the Dutch Government in reference to this incident.

At the end of the year the claims to Dutch territory which the Belgian Government were making caused great indignation in the Netherlands, but the proposal to internationalise the Lower Scheldt was received with less hostility.

SWITZERLAND.

The year 1918, during which Dr. F. L. Calonder, of Graubunden, was President, was somewhat troublous. The Swiss people had suffered quite severe privations owing to the war, and almost from the beginning of the conflict had been obliged to submit to food rationing. Partly on account of these privations the country was troubled on several occasions during the year by socialistic agitations. On July 12 the Government issued a decree designed to enable the authorities to maintain order in the face of the agitations which were arising in the country. The decree in question empowered the cantonal executives to take special measures in case of necessity, such as forbidding political meetings, and even breaking up such meetings by the police. The central Socialist organisation asked the Government to withdraw this decree, and threatened that in the event of refusal a general strike would be proclaimed. The Government refused to withdraw the decree, but they made concessions to the working classes in other directions, such as measures against food profiteering, and increases of wages, and shortening of the hours of work. Owing to these concessions the Socialists withdrew their threat of a general strike.

In the middle of October a referendum was taken in the federation on the question of introducing the principle of Proportional Representation for the House of Representatives (National Council). The Bill embodying this reform was supported by 297,000 votes against 147,000 votes; and in the voting by cantons the Bill was supported by all the provinces except three. In the middle of November the conflict between the Socialists and the Government broke out anew, and on November 11 a general strike was proclaimed by the Socialists, and took effect in all the German cantons. The strike caused serious interruptions of business, but there were no violent conflicts between the troops and the agitators. The troops remained loyal to the Government, and chiefly owing to this fact the strike broke down after forty-eight hours.

After the revolution in Germany the small districts of Busingen, Jestetten, and Lottstetten, in Baden, declared themselves united to the canton of Schaffhausen. Of greater importance, possibly, was a movement in Vorarlberg, advocating union with the Swiss Confederation.

On December 11 the Federal Assembly, by a large majority, elected M. Gustave Ador, of Geneva, President of Switzerland for 1919. Signor Giuseppe Motta, of Ticino, was elected Vice-President.

LIECHTENSTEIN.

This small German State appears to have been occupied by Austrian troops up to the time of the armistice. At the time of the revolutions in Central Europe, however, the Prince did not share the fate of the other German Sovereigns. He retained his throne, but an agitation for reform arose in the little country. The proposed reforms gained the support of the majority of the Diet. The reform movement appears to have been opposed by the Sovereign, and at the end of December it was announced that the Legislature had been prorogued until the end of March.

SPAIN.

At the beginning of the year 1918 the political situation in Spain was of an exceptionally interesting character, notwithstanding the fact that the country had been less influenced by the war than any other State on the European continent. The year 1917 had nevertheless been decidedly eventful in Spanish affairs. There had been several changes of Government, from one shade of Liberalism to another, and from Liberalism to Conservatism, and two movements had been threatening the country with serious disturbance. In the first place there had been semi-mutinous agitations among the officers of the Army and the officials of the Civil Service (particularly the former) for higher pay and better conditions of service generally; and secondly, there had been very forcible propaganda, to some

extent exceeding the limits of Constitutionalism, among the Catalanian Regionalists for what in England would be styled Home Rule for that province. In October a Coalition Government was formed under the presidency of the veteran Liberal leader, the Marquis Alhucemas, and it was hoped that this Ministry would prove stable. The Cabinet included several Conservatives, notably the well-known Senor Don F. Prida; and it also included two of the Catalanian Regionalist leaders, Senor Ventosa and Senor Rodes, which was quite a new departure. The Cabinet, however, had no confidence in their power to hold the country together in the disturbed circumstances, and at the end of December it was decided to dissolve Parliament.

The General Election was held on February 24. It was stated that the elections in the various constituencies were held without the surreptitious pressure from the Government which had disfigured Spanish politics in the past; but the Republicans contended that this freedom from illegitimate interference did not really exist. Independent observers stated that although there was some purchase of votes, the elections were undoubtedly less impure than in the past. The results of the elections constituted a severe defeat for the extremists, the Moderate Conservatives and Moderate Liberals being again returned to the Lower House with a very large majority. On the other hand, the Catalanian Regionalists gained ground. The Moderate Conservatives (followers of Senor Dato and Senor La Cierva) obtained 119 seats. The Carlists won only nine seats, and the extreme Conservatives (followers of Senor Maura), some of whom were not free from a suspicion of Carlism, won only twenty-seven constituencies. The Liberals won 165 seats. The avowed Regionalists won thirty-five seats, and they were known to have many sympathisers among the Liberals and Independents. The politicians of the Extreme Left, as already stated, fared very badly. The Radicals or Reformists were successful in only nine cases. The Republicans won only fifteen seats, and only six Socialists were returned as deputies. There were about twenty Independent members, the total number of deputies being 408. The proportionate strength of parties in the Senate, a part of which, it will be remembered, was elective, was much the same after this election as in the Lower House. Among the personal incidents of the elections, the most interesting were the defeat of Senor Lerroux, the leader of the Republicans, at Barcelona, and the defeat of Senor M. Alvarez, the leader of the Radicals, in one of the constituencies of Madrid.

No sooner had the elections taken place than friction arose in the Cabinet, notwithstanding the Ministerial successes. The two Regionalist members of the Government, Senor Ventosa and Senor Rodes, contended that the Catalanian Home Rule policy ought to find a place in the Speech from the Throne. This was opposed by all the other members of the Cabinet, and owing to the friction the Marquis Alhucemas tendered his

resignation to the King. King Alphonso, however, expressed his confidence in the marquis and asked him to remain in office. But the resignations of the Regionalist Ministers were accepted. The Government then began to consider the proposed reforms in the payment of the officers of the Army. A further conflict of opinion arose as to the method of carrying through these reforms. Senor La Cierva, who was Minister of War, desired to promulgate the reforms by Royal decree, but other leading statesmen held that Parliament ought first to be consulted. Since the military reforms involved an expenditure of no less than 8,000,000*l.* sterling, it would seem that the latter statesmen were in the right. However, at a Cabinet Council held on March 6 it was agreed that the reforms should be promulgated by Royal decree, but should be subsequently laid before Parliament for ratification. The Minister of Marine, Senor Gimeno, dissented from this course and consequently resigned. The friction, however, continued, as some of the other Ministers remained lukewarm in support of Senor La Cierva's policy, and within a few days the Cabinet again resigned. Senor La Cierva was criticised in particular by Senor de Toca, who was a former President of the Senate. The King again asked the Marquis Alhucemas to remain in power, but at the end of the month the Premier felt obliged to resign for the third time.

In the meantime Parliament had been opened, so that the continuing Cabinet crisis was particularly inconvenient. The situation was further complicated by unrest in the country and by strikes. On this third occasion the King accepted the Marquis Alhucemas' resignation; and the monarch on his own initiative asked for the advice of Senor Antonio Maura and requested that statesman to form a Cabinet. Senor Maura accepted the invitation, and a new Cabinet was constituted on March 22. The new Cabinet was a Coalition of Conservatives and Liberals, and since it naturally had the support of Senor Maura's own followers, it was in that sense even wider than the preceding Government. Senor La Cierva, who had dominated the previous Cabinet, was not a member of the new Ministry, but the Marquis Alhucemas became Minister of the Interior. Senor Eduardo Dato became Minister for Foreign Affairs, and the famous Liberal, Count de Romanones, who, like Senor Dato, was an ex-Prime Minister, became Minister of Justice. Senor Santiago Alba became Minister of Public Instruction. The new Ministry was greeted with enthusiasm by Parliament and by the populace in Madrid, who were delighted to see a Ministry which they thought would be able to deal with the strikes and with the discontent so prevalent in the Army. Senor Maura said that the proposed reforms in the Army would be thoroughly discussed by Parliament.

During the summer serious friction arose between Spain and Germany owing to the sinking of Spanish vessels by German submarines, and during August diplomatic notes were exchanged

between the two Governments. The Spanish Government said that German ships would be seized in compensation for the Spanish ships sunk. The German Government replied that the exceptional treatment of one Power in the submarine war was naturally impossible. After much discussion a compromise was reached, the German Government agreeing to hand over seven of their ships to Spain (which constituted, however, a very inadequate compensation for the Spanish ships sunk), to pay compensation for any ships which might be sunk outside the war zone, and to respect the Spanish flag provided that flag were flown exclusively by Spanish ships engaged in purely Spanish trade. This last provision was, however, opposed vigorously by France, the French Government declaring that they would treat any ship in possession of a German safe conduct as a hostile vessel. The matter therefore remained unsettled during the last weeks of the war, though a few German ships in Spanish ports were requisitioned.

In October new political crises arose. On October 9 it was announced that Senor Alba had resigned. The Premier then also resigned, but was asked by the King to remain in office. Senor Maura continued in power for a month longer, but on November 6 the whole Cabinet once more resigned. Four days later it was announced that the Marquis Alhucemas had again become Premier. The new Cabinet represented a combination of all the Liberal groups, Count Romanones (who had always been favourable to the Entente) being Foreign Minister, and Senor Alba, Minister of Finance. The first duty of the new Cabinet was to pass the Budget. It was realised on all hands that the life of the Cabinet must be brief.

In December there was yet another change of Government, and Count Romanones, though supported by only a small minority of the Lower House, became Premier. The Marquis Alhucemas and Senor Alba were not members of the new Cabinet.

The question of Catalonian autonomy was seriously exercising the minds of Spanish statesmen in December, and the new Government proposed to appoint an extra-parliamentary commission to investigate the entire problem.

PORTUGAL.

It will be remembered that in December, 1917, a Revolution took place in Portugal, a country which had become almost as prone to internal violence and revolutions as the smaller South American republics. The leader of the revolutionaries was a Major Sionio Paes, and after the success of the movement, Major Paes was appointed provisional President by his friends. At the beginning of March there was a Cabinet crisis, some of the Ministers having quarrelled with Senhor Paes, but after the dissentients had been expelled, the Cabinet was reconstructed. Senhor Paes appeared to desire to govern with some

show of constitutional authority, and on April 28 a Presidential Election was held on the basis of direct universal suffrage. In the result, Senhor Paes was elected by a considerable majority. At the same time a Parliamentary General Election was held, and this resulted in an overwhelming victory for the Republicans. In the House of Representatives the Republicans secured 108 seats, the Monarchists 39, and the Clericals 8. After the elections the Cabinet was again reconstructed. Senhor E. S. Lima became Minister for Foreign Affairs; Senhor A. Motta became Minister for War, and Senhor X. Esteves became Finance Minister.

On May 10 Senhor Paes was formally declared President in Lisbon, and it was announced that he had been supported by 513,958 votes. After the official declaration of the poll Senhor Paes made a speech. He declared that it was totally erroneous to say that he and his Government were lukewarm in the cause of the Allies. He said that, on the contrary, he was fervent in the cause of the countries fighting for justice. The figures of his election had, he said, proved that he possessed the confidence of the Portuguese people, and he would endeavour to repay this confidence by labouring for the good of the country.

Parliament was opened by the President on July 23. In his address the President again declared that he would maintain a perfect accord with the friends and Allies of Portugal. The President also said that he was glad to be able to state that Portuguese relations with neutrals were free from difficulties, and, in particular, that he had received evidences of friendship from Spain. Diplomatic intercourse had been resumed with the See of Rome, and he believed that this had met with the approval of the Portuguese people.

At the beginning of October the President was himself obliged to face a violent revolutionary movement which was supported, among others, by Dr. A. de Castro, formerly Governor of Mozambique. This movement was successfully suppressed, however, and Dr. de Castro and other leaders were arrested. Nevertheless, the agitation in the country continued. On December 6 a revolutionary attempted to shoot Senhor Paes, but was unsuccessful. Nine days later, however, a second attempt was made on the President's life at the railway station in Lisbon, and on this occasion Senhor Paes was wounded by two shots. He was taken to the hospital, but died shortly afterwards.

Immediately after the assassination, both Chambers met to consider the situation. And a few days later it was announced that a new Cabinet had been formed, with Senhor Tamagnini Barboza as Premier and Minister of the Interior. Senhor M. Reimao became Minister of Finance, and Senhor A. Neves became Minister for Foreign Affairs.

DENMARK AND ICELAND.

The year was somewhat eventful in Denmark, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Zahle, the Prime Minister, was able to maintain without serious difficulty the country's neutrality in the Great War. Mr. Zahle, the Radical leader, had been at the head of a Coalition Government since 1916, and the Ministry included leaders of both the Conservative and Socialist Parties. At the end of 1917, however, the Conservative Party became much incensed with the Socialist Minister, Mr. Stauning, on account of the latter's activities in connexion with the abortive Socialist Peace Conference of Stockholm. The Conservative member of the Cabinet, Mr. Rottböll, remained in the Government until January, but he then resigned, and Mr. Christensen, the representative of the Liberal Party in the Cabinet, also resigned at the same time. It was clearly no longer possible to maintain the political truce, and owing to the antagonisms engendered between the Conservatives and the Liberals on the one side and the Socialists on the other side, Mr. Zahle decided that the General Election, which was not due until May, should be held on April 22. The elections were of peculiar interest, because they were held on a new and very democratic franchise, including general Woman's Suffrage.

The result of the elections to the Rigsdag was a reduction in the Ministerial majority. In the elections to the Folketing, thirty-two Radicals and thirty-nine Socialists were returned, the Socialist supporting the Radical Government. On the other hand, the Liberals were very successful and secured forty-five seats in the Lower House. There were twenty-three Conservative Deputies elected. Thus, the Government majority was reduced to three. The elections to the Landsting were held at the beginning of May, and in these the Government were badly defeated; twenty-six Liberals and eighteen Conservatives were elected, as against only thirteen Radicals and fifteen Socialists.

The Rigsdag was opened by the King in person on May 28, the session taking place in the restored Palace of Christiansborg, which had been destroyed about thirty-five years previously through fire. After the debate on the address, the Folketing passed a vote of confidence in the Zahle Ministry by 70 votes to 62.

Throughout the year the most important question facing the Danish Government was that of Denmark's relations to Iceland. The Icelandic people had been agitating for years for the establishment of a greater equality of status between the two countries. As a symbol of this greater equality, the Icelanders demanded their own commercial flag. During the summer, negotiations between the Icelandic and Danish Governments proceeded satisfactorily, and a Bill was drawn up embodying proposals to establish an equality of status. The

movement may be compared to that by which Hungary became the equal of Austria. According to the terms of the Bill, Iceland became a Sovereign State, having the same Sovereign as Denmark. The Bill was first submitted to the Icelandic Legislature, where it was passed by 37 votes to 2, and it was subsequently ratified by a plebiscite in the island, the result of which was that the Bill was confirmed by a majority of about 12,000 votes against 1,000. In Denmark the Bill possessed the support not only of the Radicals and Socialists, but of the Liberals also, and it was hence assured a safe passage through the Rigsdag. It was, however, opposed by the Conservatives, chiefly on the ground that it did not provide for a satisfactory diplomatic unity. The Bill was introduced in the Folketing on November 14, and was passed a few days later by 100 votes to 20. The Bill was subsequently passed by the Landsting by 42 votes to 15, and hence became law.

After the conclusion of the armistice with Germany there was much discussion in Denmark on the problem of Schleswig, and it was proposed that Denmark should enter a claim at the Peace Conference for the return of the Danish-speaking districts of the Duchy. The Danish proposals on this question gained in force by their moderation and essential reasonableness. There was no thought of demanding the return of the whole of Schleswig-Holstein. On the contrary, it was thoroughly realised in Copenhagen that the people of Holstein were Germans and would desire to remain within the German State. Most Danish publicists did not even ask for the return of the whole of Schleswig, South Schleswig (though historically Danish) having been very largely Germanised. The claim which found general support in Denmark was the indisputably reasonable proposition that a referendum should be held in Northern Schleswig, possibly only in the district north of a line running from Flensburg to Tondern, in order that the people might decide their own destiny. The people of Northern Schleswig being Danish in speech and notoriously Danish in sentiment, there appeared to be but little doubt as to what would be the result of such a plebiscite.

SWEDEN.

At the end of the year 1917 a fundamental change took place in the direction of Swedish policy both in external and in internal affairs. In Sweden there was, and had been for many years, a very sharp difference between the Conservative Party on the one hand, and the Liberal and Socialist Parties on the other hand. The Conservatives were, for the most part, very Conservative, and the Liberals were inclined as a rule to be extremely Radical. Now, whilst the European War had been raging, and up till the end of 1917, a Conservative Government under Mr. Hammarskjöld had been in power, and this Govern-

ment had been accused in western countries, and not altogether without reason, of being pro-German in its foreign policy and reactionary in domestic matters. The Conservative Cabinet had, however, been the subject of severe criticisms from Swedish democrats, and its position during the early part of 1917 had been continually insecure. In September a General Election was held, the result being a decisive defeat for the Conservatives. The new House of Representatives contained nearly one hundred Socialists, whilst the Liberals and Conservatives each had a force of about sixty deputies. After the elections a Coalition Government of Liberals and Socialists was formed. Mr. Eden, the Liberal leader, becoming Prime Minister, whilst Mr. Branting, the famous leader of the Socialist Party, was given the post of Finance Minister, which, however, he resigned early in 1918. It should be added that a section of extremists broke away from Mr. Branting's party and adopted a line of policy independently of the majority of the Socialists. This, therefore, was the position at the beginning of 1918.

Parliament was opened by the King on January 16, and in his Speech from the Throne King Gustav referred first to the general suffering and privation caused in Sweden through the obstruction of trade due to the war. The King and the Government were endeavouring to pilot the country through this difficult situation, and the corner-stone of their policy continued to be the maintenance of strict neutrality. King Gustav said that in collaboration with the other Scandinavian Powers, he had been endeavouring to prepare the way for a lasting peace, and the establishment of such international legal regulations as would safeguard the rights of all nations. In connexion with this matter the King had visited Norway for the first time since the dissolution of the union, and he was glad to find that this step had been cordially welcomed. The meeting of the three Scandinavian Sovereigns in Christiania had been productive of still more sympathetic relations between the Scandinavian countries. The latter part of the speech dealt with the question of Finland. The independence of that nation had been promptly recognised by the Swedish Government; and the King hoped that Finland would unite her efforts to those of Scandinavia for the attainment of peace and progress. The monarch also hoped that the independence of Finland would facilitate a satisfactory settlement of the Aaland question.

On January 23 interesting debates took place in both Houses of the Riksdag. The policy of the Government was severely criticised by the Conservative leaders, more particularly by Admiral Lindman in the Second Chamber. The Admiral, who had been Foreign Minister in the previous Conservative Government, said that the only way to solve the question of the Aaland Islands was to meet the declared wishes of the islanders and annex them to Sweden. Referring to the negotiations which were proceeding for the loan of Swedish shipping to Great

Britain, the Admiral said that Sweden's commercial power after the war ought not to be imperilled, and it would be a serious danger to the country if at the end of the war Sweden found herself with a considerably reduced mercantile marine. The Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Hellner, replied to these criticisms. He said that the Government thought it necessary to come to an agreement with one group of Powers on the essential question of obtaining certain raw materials, even though, in order to do so, a portion of the mercantile marine would have to be sacrificed.

This debate in the Lower House illustrates the cautious and largely Anglophile policy which the Swedish Government pursued throughout the year. On February 2 King Gustav received a deputation from the Aaland Islands asking for reunion of the Islands with Sweden. In reply to the petitions of the deputation, the King made a somewhat non-committal speech, but said that he hoped the difficulties in the way of the realisation of the islanders' wishes might be overcome. At the end of February a small Swedish force was actually sent to the Aaland Islands, but after the interference of Germany in that region, the Swedish Government, in accordance with their determination not to become involved in the European conflagration, withdrew their troops.

In a debate in the Lower House on February 21, the Prime Minister declared that the Government had no intention of undertaking armed invasion in Finland. The forces in Finland fighting for law and order had the Government's full sympathy, but Sweden would remain neutral. The Government must even refuse to allow the Finns to purchase arms in Sweden, or even to have arms transported through the country. The Finns were, however, well able to obtain arms elsewhere. The Conservative speakers severely criticised this declaration. They said that the refusal of the Government to allow the "White" Finns to purchase arms in Sweden had driven the Finnish Government into the arms of Germany.

The negotiations with Great Britain, in regard to the loan of Swedish ships, proceeded in London for some months, and were brought to a successful conclusion, notwithstanding the opposition of the Swedish Conservative Party. It was duly announced in June that 400,000 tons of Swedish shipping would be lent to the Allies, and in return stipulated quantities of food-stuffs and raw materials would be imported into Sweden on the understanding that neither these goods themselves, nor their ultimate products, would be re-exported to the Central Powers. The agreement also included a provision limiting the export of iron ore to Germany.

In the autumn, during a special session of the Riksdag, the Government introduced a Bill for the democratisation of the communal franchise, which would automatically alter the complexion of the Upper House, the members of that Chamber

being elected indirectly through the medium of the district councils. The Bill met with considerable opposition from the Conservatives, but was passed by both Houses in December.

NORWAY.

The beginning of the year found Mr. Gunnar Knudsen, the Radical leader, still at the head of the King's Government. A General Election was due, however, in 1918, and it was believed that the position of the Radicals had been somewhat undermined, not on account of their foreign policy, but owing to the tendency which the Government had shown towards schemes of State Socialism, and also on account of a general reaction against Radicalism and Socialism, which was brought about in Norway through the excesses of the Socialists in other parts of Europe.

A general census was taken on January 1, and the results of the numbering were published in December. It was shown that the total Norwegian population was 2,611,287.

During the first ten months of the year Norway continued to be adversely affected by the war. In the first place, the German submarines continued to sink vessels of the Norwegian mercantile marine, as the captains of these vessels still did not hesitate to navigate in the so-called barred zone. On the other side, the country was suffering from a dearth of food, as it was found very difficult to secure supplies from the United States owing to the American fear of the re-export of food to Germany. In the spring the Norse Government entered into negotiations with America for the supply of food and raw materials, and, after considerable discussion, a satisfactory agreement was reached, although it was necessary for the system of food rationing to continue.

The General Election began on October 22, but owing to the necessity of holding the second ballots, the elections were spread over several weeks. In the outgoing Storting, the Radical Party possessed a small majority over all other parties combined. The elections, however, were a blow to Mr. Knudsen's policy. The parties were returned in the following strength: Conservatives, 35; Agrarian Union, 2; Liberals, 16; Radicals, 52; Labour-Democrats, 3; and Socialists, 18. The movement of opinion to the Right was unmistakable and marked. The combined Labour-Democrats and Socialists returned only slightly weaker than before, but the Radicals lost twenty-two seats. The Conservatives gained fourteen seats. The Liberals had possessed only one representative in the previous Parliament. It was expected that the Liberals would co-operate with the Conservatives. It was reported that about 690,000 votes were cast, of which rather less than 33 per cent. were given to the Government candidates. It was stated that many voters did not go to the poll owing to the prevalence of Spanish influenza.

The loss of ships owing to the German submarine campaign has already been mentioned above. After the conclusion of the armistice the Ministry of Marine published figures relating to the Norwegian shipping losses during the war. It was stated that 831 Norwegian vessels of 1,238,297 registered tons had been lost. Of these, 652 were steamers and the remainder sailing ships. Thirty-two of the steamers lost had been requisitioned by the British Government. In regard to the casualties incurred during these sinkings, it was stated that 1,120 lives had been lost, and that a number of other seamen had been wounded or injured.

SPITSBERGEN.

During the year the question of the political status of Spitsbergen arose. The problem of the status of the northern archipelago, and the strategic importance of the country to Great Britain in the new circumstances, were brought to the attention of the British Government by the Royal Geographical Society early in 1917. A clause relating to Spitsbergen was inserted by the Germans in the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, and it was apparently proposed by the German Government that the archipelago should be divided between the Muscovite Republic and the German Empire. This proposal naturally attracted much attention in England, and on September 27 the British flag was hoisted at Ebeltoft Harbour, and the German wireless station which existed in that locality was destroyed. It appeared, however, that the Dutch possessed legitimate political rights over the north-western part of the island. The Germans protested against any idea of the annexation of Spitsbergen to Great Britain, and contended that at the Conference in Christiania in 1914, Spitsbergen had been declared a "No-Man's Land." It was to be presumed that the status of the archipelago, whose mineral wealth had recently come to be realised, would be decided at the general Peace Conference.

CHAPTER V.

SOUTHERN ASIA.

CYPRUS.

THIS colony passed through a prosperous year, and the chief political question before the people continued to be the possibility of union with Greece. It will be remembered that the population (of about a quarter of a million) consisted of about 80 per cent. Greeks and 20 per cent. Turks. After the final victory of the Associated Powers in November, the Greek members of the Legislative Council sent telegrams congratulating Great Britain, the United States, and France, on the victory,

but adding that they hoped that the desires of the Cypriotes would be satisfied at the forthcoming Peace Conference. The desires to which reference was made were of course the notorious aspiration of the Greek element of the population for union with the Hellenic kingdom. At the end of the year, also, a deputation with a similar object was sent to Athens to lay the opinions of the Cypriotes before M. Venizelos.

THE HEJAZ.

It will be remembered that during 1916 the Grand Shereef of Mecca, Hussein Ibu Ali, who was the greatest of the Arabian chiefs, had declared himself independent of Turkey, and had taken the title of King of the Hejaz. The Arab forces, owing allegiance to King Hussein, co-operated with the British in the operations in Palestine, and the successful part in the war played by these irregular troops had the effect of strengthening the position of the newly established State. The King's son, the Emir Feisul, led the Arab cavalry in a most gallant manner, and after the conclusion of the armistice this Prince paid a visit to London, where he had a warm reception.

PERSIA.

The Shah's Government continued to maintain the official neutrality of Persia throughout the last ten months of the war, but the problem presented by the extreme weakness of the Persian administration continued to exercise the minds of statesmen in India and in England. The dissolution of the Russian Empire had caused not unnatural rejoicings in Persia, both in Teheran and in Tabriz, and the Persian Nationalists hoped that the destruction of the Tsar's power would enable them to assert and maintain a genuine independence. At the beginning of May the Government decided to take official action upon this point. All Persian Ambassadors were instructed to make it known to the various foreign Governments that henceforth the Persian Government would regard all treaties that had been imposed upon Persia in recent years, and more particularly the Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907, as null and void. The Ambassadors were also instructed to explain that whilst other treaties might possibly be renewed in a revised form, the Anglo-Russian treaty of 1907 would be regarded as definitely annulled.

It was clear from this action that the Persian Government were desirous of asserting the independence of the country. The Persians, however, possessed no reliable army, and the Government was unable to protect the frontiers from foreign incursions. The Russian troops, which had for so long occupied the province of Azerbaijan, had been withdrawn by the Republican Government, and the Turks had also undertaken to withdraw their troops from the country. But before the end

of May, Turkish forces re-entered Persia from two directions. A Turkish Army made its way eastwards along the southern shores of Lake Urumiah, and another Ottoman detachment entered Azerbaijan from the direction of Erivan. And in the middle of June the Turks occupied the great town of Tabriz, which had for so long been the centre of Russian influence in Persia. In reply to this movement on the part of the Turks, General Marshall, in command of the British Mesopotamian Expeditionary Force, sent a small detachment under General Dunsterville, up the southern and western shores of the Caspian Sea. The force pressed on beyond the Persian frontier, and at the end of July reached the great port of Baku. On August 5 the Turks attacked the British positions at Baku, but were successfully driven off. It was hoped that General Dunsterville would receive support from the local Armenians and Russians, but the assistance which he received from the local armed bands does not seem to have been satisfactory. General Dunsterville planned an attack upon the Turks on August 17, but the scheme miscarried owing to the cowardice of the Armenians. The small Turkish army seems to have been reinforced, and at the beginning of September the withdrawal of the British force became necessary. The retreat was beset with considerable difficulties, and it was not until September 15 that the British successfully evacuated their positions at Baku.

According to the terms of the armistice imposed upon Turkey by the Western Powers at the end of October, Persia was to be immediately evacuated by the Turkish troops.

AFGHANISTAN.

Very little news from this country reached England during the year. It was reported from India that the Ameer continued to maintain his neutrality in the war in a most scrupulous and loyal manner.

INDIA.

It has been stated in previous numbers of the ANNUAL REGISTER that the great sub-continent of Hindustan was to be regarded as little more than nominally belligerent in the World War. The sub-continent had, in practice, been almost outside the range of the flames. Whilst this remained largely true up to the end of the war, yet as the conflict progressed towards its termination the efforts made by India were somewhat more appreciable, although of course these efforts remained extremely small in comparison with the forces exerted by the European belligerents. Nevertheless, as the statistics given later will show, the contribution made by India to the Imperial Forces, though proportionately small, was actually very considerable. And the increasing contribution made by India was undoubtedly

one of the characteristics of the last twelve months of the war.

During the year under discussion, however, the whole question of the war was overshadowed in India by the problem of Constitutional Reform. It will be remembered that in November, 1917, Mr. Montagu, the Secretary of State for India, had arrived in Hindustan with the object of holding conferences with representatives of all races, classes, and religions on the question of the reform of the system of Indian administration. The Secretary of State remained in India during the first few months of 1918 and continued his important investigation. After his return to England a monumental Report signed by himself and by the Viceroy, Lord Chelmsford, was published, and this Report will be found in full elsewhere.¹

The publication of these official recommendations made the year 1918 a landmark in the history of India.

The Annual Budget was submitted to the Imperial Legislature by the Financial Secretary, Sir William Meyer, on March 1. The statement was of a highly satisfactory character, for Sir William Meyer was able to report that an unexpected surplus of about 8,000,000*l.* had been realised during the year 1917-18. These revised estimates of the revenue and expenditure for the financial year 1917-18 were stated to be as follows:—

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Imperial Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | £76,677,400 |
| Provincial Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | 33,723,900 |
| Total | | | | | | | <u>£110,401,300</u> |
| Imperial Expenditure | - | - | - | - | - | - | £70,852,300 |
| Provincial Expenditure | - | - | - | - | - | - | 31,467,700 |
| Total | | | | | | | <u>£102,320,000</u> |

A sum of 2,560,200*l.* had, however, been added to the provincial balances, so that the total expenditure including this item amounted to 104,576,200*l.*, and the final surplus was thus 5,825,100*l.* The revenue was over 11,000,000*l.* greater than had been anticipated; the chief item in this improvement being the railway receipts, which were nearly 4,000,000*l.* greater than had been anticipated, and the Customs, Salt Duty, and Income Tax had also brought in funds in excess of expectations. Owing, however, to the increased military efforts, the expenditure had been over 3,000,000*l.* greater than had been anticipated twelve months earlier.

Passing on to the Budget for the year 1918-19, the following are the chief figures given out:—

¹ The Montagu-Chelmsford Report will be found fully summarised in Public Documents, p. 82.

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---------------------|
| Imperial Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | £73,999,200 |
| Provincial Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | 34,347,700 |
| | | | | | | Total | <u>£108,346,900</u> |
| Imperial Expenditure | - | - | - | - | - | - | £71,707,700 |
| Provincial Expenditure | - | - | - | - | - | - | 34,443,000 |
| | | | | | | Total | <u>£106,150,700</u> |

It was expected, however, that 95,300%. would be drawn from provincial balances, so that the total expenditure to be met from the revenue of the new financial year would be 106,055,400%. It was stated that no new taxation would be imposed in the year 1918-19. Sir William Meyer drew attention to the fact that over 30,000,000%. sterling had been produced from the Indian War Loan of the previous year, and he said that this sum had been paid to the Treasury in reduction of India's liability for 100,000,000%. sterling of War Debt.

Lord Chelmsford opened the spring session of the Imperial Legislative Council on February 6. The Viceroy made a long speech and referred to the subject of Constitutional Reform. He said that the Secretary of State for India and himself had received deputations from all classes, and he said that the addresses and memoranda submitted to them by these deputations had been drawn up with great ability, and with an almost universal desire to co-operate in the good government of India. The Viceroy also said that he himself and all members of the Government of India appreciated the manner in which Mr. Montagu had been dealing with his extremely difficult task.

The spring session of the Legislature was notable for the larger part taken in the debates by the official members of the House. This was of course a source of satisfaction to the non-official members, for in the past it had sometimes been not unnaturally exasperating to the non-official members to find themselves voted down by persons who took but little part in the debates, and gave no reasons for the manner in which they cast their votes.

At the end of April a great War Conference was held under the presidency of the Viceroy at Delhi. This was a most remarkable gathering. Many of the feudatory princes, all the non-official members of the Imperial Legislature, and representatives sent by the Provincial Governments were present. The Conference was opened on April 27. Among those present were the Maharajah of Bikaner, the Maharajah of Patiala, the Maharajah of Jaipur, the Gaekwar of Baroda, and the Begum of Bhopal. In his opening speech the Viceroy said that the Indian Mohammedans had proved too sagacious and too loyal to fall into the trap set for them by the Turkish Government; and the machinations of the Ottomans had been frustrated by the victorious campaigns in Palestine and Mesopotamia. The Russian Revolution had, however, said the Viceroy, raised a threat on

the northern frontiers of India where agents of disintegration were already at work. The Ameer of Afghanistan had, however, proved a staunch and loyal ally, and he was a bulwark in the north against the intrigues of the enemy. Nevertheless, in Afghanistan as in India there were ignorant and fanatical people, and it was only right that the Indian Government should stand ready with munitions and men to assist the Ameer in repelling foreign aggression, if that should be necessary. Continuing, Lord Chelmsford said that the military position of India was strong, but he hoped the people would realise that the war was India's war, and that those who went to fight were fighting for their own country. It was true to say that the issue hung in the balance, for the fate of India would be decided on the battlefields of France. Lord Chelmsford then announced that two committees had been appointed to investigate the subjects of man-power and resources respectively, and these committees would report to the War Conference.

The session of the War Conference was resumed on April 29, and on that day a resolution was moved by the Gaekwar of Baroda, requesting the Viceroy to convey to the Emperor an expression of India's loyalty and desire to do her utmost in assisting in the war. The resolution was warmly supported by the leading Chiefs, including the Begum of Bhopal, and the Maharajahs of Gwalior, Bikaner, and Patiala. The resolution was also supported by Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Surendranath Banerjee. In regard to the two committees mentioned above, the Man-Power Committee strongly supported a large increase in voluntary recruitment, but they considered conscription unnecessary. The recommendations of the Resources Committee were important and interesting. They believed that all classes would welcome the control of the materials necessary for victory. They also desired to encourage the consumption of local articles locally, in order to reduce railway traffic, and they recommended that the Government should construct river vessels, ocean sailing ships, and, if practicable, ocean steamers, by subsidies in aid of private enterprise. A resolution was moved by no less a person than the Maharajah of Kashmir, endorsing the recommendations put forward by these two committees. The Viceroy in his closing speech declared that he had found the proceedings of the Conference most inspiring.

The recommendations of the Delhi War Conference were carried into effect largely through the instrumentality of the Provincial Governments.

The Report of Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford on the subject of Indian Reform was published on July 4, after Mr. Montagu's return to England. A full summary of the recommendations will be found elsewhere (see Public Documents, p. 82). The Report was published in two parts. The first part dealt with existing conditions in India, more particularly with the effects of the war upon the dependency, and with the practical

working of the Morley-Minto reforms. Part II. contained the recommendations for reform. It was suggested that there should be a general devolution of Powers from the Central Government to the Provincial authorities, and that in the Provinces Representative Legislative Councils should be created, possessing at first, however, only limited powers. It was proposed that the councils should contain a majority of elected Indian deputies. It was contemplated that the functions of the councils should be gradually widened. Thus, the central idea of the Report was the education of Indians in the art of self-government by giving them at once an important influence in provincial affairs.

The monumental Report had a mixed reception in India. The more Conservative members of the British community held that the proposed reforms were too extensive, and that British supremacy in India was not sufficiently safeguarded. Other members of the British community, however, held that the Report was a most sagacious and timely document, and thought that, with the growth of education among the Indian natives, a reform of the system of Government upon such lines as those suggested in the Report would be inevitable within a limited time. Among the Indians opinion was equally divided. The important and well-educated group of what may be called the Indian Moderates welcomed the new scheme with warmth; thus, the reforms were supported by Judge Sastri, and the Report was accepted and supported by leading Bengalees, including Mr. Surendranath Banerjee, Mr. B. C. Mitra, Sir Ragendra Nath Mookerjee, and Sir Krisna Gupta. On the other hand, the Indian extremists, including the majority of the leaders of the so-called Indian National Congress, rejected the proposed scheme as quite inadequate; thus the well-known Indian extremist, Mr. Tilak, declared that the Report did not go nearly far enough. And Mrs. Annie Besant, who, it will be remembered, had thrown in her lot with the Indian extremists, condemned the Report in unmeasured terms.

At the end of July a Report was published by a committee which had been appointed under the presidency of Mr. Justice Rowlatt to inquire into the problem of sedition in India. The Report, which was issued unanimously by the committee, traced the whole course of revolutionary agitation in India from 1897 onwards. The Report laid great stress on the evil influence exercised by the writings of Mr. Tilak. It transpired that much of the agitation in India had been stirred up indirectly by extremists who had left the country and were living in Paris or in the United States, and it was clear that recent revolutionary conspiracies had been assisted by agents of the German Government.

At the end of July the Government of India announced that the British Government, after consultation with the Government of India, had decided to issue new regulations by which

commissions in the Army should be granted to Indians. It was explained that (1) a certain number of substantive commissions in the Indian Army should be granted to selected Indian officers who had specially distinguished themselves in the war, and (2) a certain number of Honorary Commissions in the Indian Army should be granted to Indian officers who might have distinguished themselves, not necessarily in the present war, but who, for educational or other reasons, were not eligible for substantive commissions, and (3) that a certain number of temporary, but substantive, commissions in the Indian Army should be given to certain selected candidates, nominated partly from civil life and partly from the Army. The announcement then laid down in detail the educational and other qualifications which would be deemed necessary in the candidates. It was stated that the Indian officers would be "subject to the same regulations, and enjoy the same status as British officers of the same rank." And it was explained that it was expected that some of the temporary officers would remain in the Indian Army after the war. It was also stated that the Government of India would nominate ten Indian gentlemen annually during the war for cadetships at the Royal Military College, Sandhurst.

As already stated, the issue of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report caused a split in the ranks of Indian politicians. Fortunately, the division was not markedly either racial or religious. There were Hindu Moderates, and Mohammedan extremists, though no doubt the Moslems were, on the whole, more moderate than the Hindus. Preparations were speedily made for the holding of the National Congress in Bombay at the end of August, and it soon became clear that whatever might be the case in the Indian population generally, among active politicians the extremists, who were hostile to the Report, were in the majority. The Congress was opened on August 29, and was held under the presidency of Mr. Hassam Imam. The Congress was attended only by the extremists. All the Indian Moderates decided to hold aloof. The President seems to have done his best to heal the schism in the Indian ranks, for he declared that whatever might be the differences of method advocated by the two groups, both parties had the same ultimate aims in view. The Congress, as was to be expected, rejected the Report; and it passed resolutions declaring that complete responsible government ought to be bestowed upon the separate provinces at the end of six years, and upon Hindustan as a whole, at the end of fifteen years. The result of the holding of this Conference was that the schism between the two Indian parties was still further widened. The Moderates held a separate Congress at Bombay at the beginning of November, under the presidency of Mr. S. Banerjee.

In opening the autumn session of the Legislative Council on September 4, Lord Chelmsford made an interesting speech. The Viceroy said that many people in the country seemed to

regard the Report on reforms as a subject for bargaining between the Indians and the Government, but this idea was entirely erroneous. The advance had been carried as far as the principles held by the Government would allow them to go. Gradual development was in accord with British political traditions, and the example of the Russian Revolution showed how fatal sudden changes might be. Referring to the results of the Delhi Conference, the Viceroy said that in the three months, May, June, and July, 97,000 combatants had been enlisted, and 55,000 non-combatants.

The most important decision taken during this session of the Legislature was to take over from Great Britain, as from April 1, the cost of the maintenance of a further 200,000 Indian troops. Up to that date the cost of maintaining only 160,000 men had fallen upon India, the remaining troops being maintained and paid by Great Britain. Thus a somewhat larger share in the upkeep of the Indian Army was borne by India during the last six months of the war. The decision on this matter was left to the non-official members of the Legislative Council, and the fact that even under these conditions the resolution obtained a majority, was naturally highly gratifying to the Government of India.

In closing the session of the Legislative Council on September 6, Lord Chelmsford made a speech in which he referred particularly to the position of the Mohammedan community. He declared that in carrying through the proposed reforms the interests of the Moslems would be given every consideration, and they would be represented on the committees dealing with the political innovations.

In the Report of Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford, it was stated that various matters had been left over for decision in accordance with advice which might be given by two committees subsequently to be appointed. These two committees were to deal respectively with questions connected with the franchise and with questions connected with the division of functions between the Government of India and the local authorities, and between official and popular elements in the local governments. In October it was announced that these two committees had been appointed. The chairman of the Franchise Committee was Lord Southborough, and the chairman of the Committee on the Division of functions was Mr. R. Feetham, who was legal adviser to the High Commissioner of South Africa.

In the autumn several changes in the *personnel* of the provincial governments were announced. It was stated that Lord Willingdon, Governor of Bombay, would become Governor of Madras, in succession to Lord Pentland, who was expected to leave that appointment in the spring. Captain G. A. Lloyd, M.P., was appointed Governor of Bombay. Further, Sir Edward D. Maclagan was appointed Lieut.-Governor of the Punjab, in succession to Sir Michael F. O'Dwyer.

After the conclusion of the armistice, statistics were published in regard to the number of men provided by India for the forces of the Empire. It was stated that up to September 30, 1918, 1,161,789 Indians were recruited, of whom 757,747 were combatants, and the remainder non-combatants. The total Indian casualties up to the same date were 101,439, more than half these casualties occurring in Mesopotamia, where nearly 15,000 Indians were killed. The number of officers and men sent to the various theatres of war were as follows :—

| | British | Indian. | Totals. |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|-----------|
| To France - - - - - | 18,934 | 131,496 | 150,430 |
| To East Africa - - - - - | 5,403 | 46,936 | 52,339 |
| To Mesopotamia - - - - - | 167,551 | 588,717 | 756,268 |
| To Egypt - - - - - | 19,166 | 116,159 | 135,325 |
| To Gallipoli - - - - - | 60 | 4,428 | 4,488 |
| To Salonika - - - - - | 66 | 4,938 | 5,004 |
| To Aden - - - - - | 7,386 | 20,243 | 27,629 |
| To Persian Gulf - - - - - | 968 | 29,457 | 30,425 |
| | 219,534 | 942,374 | 1,161,908 |

SIAM.

The King of Siam continued to co-operate in foreign policy with Great Britain and the other Entente Powers. All Germans of both sexes, who were living in Siam, were deported to India early in the year.

CHAPTER VI.

THE FAR EAST: CHINA—JAPAN—NETHERLANDS EAST INDIES.

CHINA.

DURING the year 1917 China became nominally belligerent against the Central Powers, having in this, as in so many other matters, followed the lead of the United States of America. Yet the immense nation of the Far East, was, in practice, hardly affected by its Government's nominal declaration of war. Very much greater interest attaches to the internal situation in China. Constant civil strife and struggles between opposed political theories characterised the years 1917 and 1918; but in considering the picture presented by China, it should never be forgotten that the lives of the Chinese millions were little influenced by the political unrest, the political storms passing for the most part over their heads.

It will be remembered that during the year 1917 there had been a struggle between the President, Li Yuan-Hung and the Legislature on the one side, and the dictatorial Prime Minister,

Tuan Chi-Jui on the other side. The President had had the support of the Southern Provinces, whilst the Prime Minister, on the other hand, was supported by the leading personages in the Northern Provinces of the country, more particularly by the Military Governors. The issue between the two parties was not of a purely personal character, although, no doubt, the personal hostility of the Premier towards the President accentuated the trouble. The leaders of the Northern Party advocated amendments in the Constitution with a view to giving the Cabinet more freedom from the constant supervision of the Diet. The struggle between these two parties during 1917 was varied by a brief and somewhat grotesque episode in Peking, when, in July, a certain General Chang-Husun had made an attempt to restore the Chinese monarchy in the person of the young Prince Hsuan-Tung. The restored monarchy had to face the active hostility of the Northern Party, and received no support from the Southerners. And within a few days General Chang-Husun's régime in the Capital was overthrown, and he himself was captured and condemned to exile.

Throughout the year 1917 the struggle continued between Li Yuan-Hung and Tuan Chi-Jui, and it was a curiously inconclusive result that at the end of the year neither of these two statesmen maintained his position. The President had resigned, and the Vice-President, Feng Kuo-Chang, had taken his place; and a certain Wang Shih-Cheng had become Prime Minister.

At the beginning of the year it was not only by the disturbed political situation that China was troubled. In the autumn of 1917 floods on an enormous scale occurred in the province of Chihli. It was stated that 14,000 square miles of the area of this province were converted into one huge lake, destroying the homes of several millions of people, and ruining the crops. Hundreds of thousands of persons were, therefore, not only rendered homeless, but were reduced to famine. Owing to the extremely bad drainage system of the country the water did not flow away, and the great new lake therefore remained for many months. The people, many of whom were isolated on small patches of rising ground, were compelled to eat leaves and roots, and even the bark of trees, and it is certain that very large numbers died, particularly the young children.

Apart from the floods, districts of Mongolia, and other parts of North China, were afflicted early in the year by an epidemic of pneumonic plague.

Throughout the year the Civil War continued in a perfunctory but sufficiently disastrous manner. The forces of North China were in reality much more powerful than those of the Southern Provinces, and there is little doubt that all Southern China would have been reconquered by the central authorities, if those same authorities had not been divided amongst themselves. In March Tuan Chi-Jui once more became Premier, but he was unable to work amicably with Feng Kuo-Chang.

The latter desired to come to an agreement with the South, and he seems to have been secretly aiming at the formation of a coalition between his own followers in the north and the southern party. It thus happened that the troops of Feng's faction did not oppose the southerners with any enthusiasm. Feng, however, did not dare to quarrel openly with Tuan, because the astute Premier had succeeded in securing the support of the Japanese Government.

In the meantime the Chinese Government do not seem to have been greatly disturbed by the anarchy which now reigned all along the north frontiers of the Chinese republic. But during March, April, and May negotiations proceeded with the Japanese Government, and it was arranged that China should accept the co-operation of Japan in the defence of the Chinese borders against the incursions of Bolsheviks.

In July, Tuan Chi-Jui's Ministry arranged for the holding of elections in China, and a new Parliament was accordingly elected, although its credentials were decidedly dubious. The new Parliament, which met in Peking, contained, as might have been expected, a majority of the An-Fu Party, that is, the followers of Tuan Chi-Jui. The Opposition were led by a politician named Liang Shih-yi, who had been one of the chief supporters of Yuan Shi-Kai, the former President. Liang Shih-yi hoped to be able to bring about a compromise between the Northern and Southern Parties, and he had suggested that the well-known statesman Hsu Shih-Chang should be appointed President. In the meantime the old Parliament had refused to be dissolved, and continued to sit in Canton. The Canton Assembly declared that the new Parliament was illegal. Towards the end of the summer the Southern Party gained in strength, and the Northerners were weakened by the defection of one of their best Generals, Wu Pei-Fu. This general was in favour of a reconciliation between the two great parties in the republic, and, indeed, it was becoming clear that even if the North could ever conquer the Southern rebels at all, such a procedure would need a prolonged campaign. The Southern Party were now supported not only by all the provinces south of the Yangtze, but also by the rulers of the great province of Zechuan.

At the beginning of September, Hsu Shih-Chang was duly elected President, though the Canton Parliament declared that they could not recognise this election. The new President fortunately belonged to the more moderate section of the Northern Party, but he appeared to be somewhat overawed by the extremist group, who were still refusing a compromise with the South. The Southern leaders, on their side, were not altogether averse from a compromise, but they remained antagonistic to Tuan Chi-Jui, and even threatened to proclaim the Canton Government as the Government of all China, and to elect Li Yuan-Hung as President. In Peking, however, Liang

Shih-yi, who had become President of the Senate, continued to work energetically for a compromise.

The hostilities were protracted through the later months of the year, but in December it appeared that the two parties were more inclined to conclude peace. This was due, in part, to the fear of intervention by the Powers; and, in fact, at the beginning of December, the Allied Governments addressed a note to the Chinese Government advising them to come to terms with the Southerners. The Civil War as it continued had caused a breakdown of the administration in many parts of the country, and brigandage became rife.

JAPAN.

During the year 1918 no events of first-rate importance occurred in Japan. The country continued to remain in close accord with the European Allies, but, as in previous years, the part actually played by Japan in the war was small in proportion to the size and power of the Japanese Empire. The chief subject which occupied the attention of the politicians in Tokyo was the question of Japanese intervention in Siberia against the Bolsheviks; and as early as January a small force of Japanese marines was landed at Vladivostock.

In an address to the Upper House on January 22, Field-Marshal Terauchi, the Premier, stated that the Government intended to continue to co-operate in all sincerity with the Allied Powers and to maintain friendly relations with China. The chief anxiety of the Government was, said the Premier, the situation in Russia. They desired to see a stable Government established in that country. But unfortunately the anarchy which had existed in European Russia had now extended to Siberia, and even to the Far East. "Japan holds herself responsible for the maintenance of peace in this part of the world; consequently, in the event of that peace being endangered, to the inestimable detriment of our interests, the Government of Japan would not hesitate a moment to take the proper measures."

On the same day Viscount Motono, the Foreign Minister, issued an address to both Houses dealing with the external relations of Japan. He said that the Japanese Government were determined to maintain friendly relations with China, and any stable Government in that country would receive Japanese support. And furthermore, the Japanese Government would take no part in any internal conflict in China. He was glad that China had decided to take the wise step of throwing in her lot with the Allies. In accord with the other Allied Governments the Japanese Ministry were considering the proposal to make concessions to China in the matter of indemnities, and a Conference on this matter was being held in Shanghai. Japan was still loyally adhering to the Declaration of London of Sep-

tember 5, 1914, that she would not make peace except in agreement with the other Allied Powers.

At the time of the conclusion of the separate peace between Russia and the Central Powers, the Japanese Government acted in close accord with the Western Powers, and at the end of February, the Japanese Ambassador in Petrograd was withdrawn, although relations with Muscovy were not entirely severed, as the Japanese Consuls remained in Russia. The question of Japanese intervention in Siberia continued to be discussed between the Tokyo Government and all the Associated Governments, more particularly with the American Government. After prolonged discussion, it was agreed that intervention should take place, and an account of the subsequent military operations will be found elsewhere (see *Siberia*, p. [234]). In April a political crisis occurred, and Viscount Motono, the Foreign Minister, resigned, and was succeeded by Baron Goto, who had previously been Minister of the Interior. Mr. R. Mizuno then became Minister of the Interior.

At the end of July serious internal disturbances arose in many parts of Japan. This was due to a cause which, in parallel circumstances, had so often operated in Europe, namely, the high price of food. The food in question was rice. The riots were begun by the fisherwomen of a small town named Toyama on the coast of the Sea of Japan. The women of Toyama marched riotously to the local Town Hall, and demanded in threatening language that the price of rice should be reduced. The agitation appears to have spread with the speed of a conflagration, and many other parts of the country became involved. In Kobe the riots were of a most serious character; the mobs became incendiary and many buildings were burnt down, including police stations and the houses of rich men, and the offices of the big rice firms. In order to prevent the spread of the agitation, the Government forbade the newspapers to publish any accounts of the unrest, but within a few days they were compelled to remove this embargo. Order was not restored without considerable difficulty. And so serious was the position deemed that in the middle of September the Terauchi Cabinet resigned. After considerable discussion the Emperor asked Mr. Kei Hara to form a Government, and this statesman consented to undertake the task. Mr. Hara was one of the best-known leaders of Marshal Terauchi's Party, the Seiyukai—the party which had obtained a majority in the General Election of the previous year. Viscount Y. Uchida, who had previously been Ambassador to Petrograd, became Minister for Foreign Affairs. Baron K. Takuhashi became Minister of Finance, and General Tanaka became Minister for War.

Mr. Hara was the first statesman, not a member of the nobility, to become Prime Minister of Japan. He was known to be a loyal supporter of the policy of the Anglo-Japanese alliance; and he opposed intervention in Siberia until the full

sanction of Great Britain and the United States had been secured. The new Cabinet was a purely Party administration, and it was expected that the new Prime Minister would adhere in general to the policy of his predecessor.

NETHERLANDS EAST INDIES.

During the year an important constitutional reform was instituted in this great insular colony. The government of the colony—all the islands, it will be remembered, had long formed one country politically—had hitherto been purely autocratic, the Governor-General and his council being invested with almost absolute authority, save in so far as they were bound to respect certain laws and regulations made by the Netherlands Parliament. A new "Volksraad," or People's Diet, was established this year, however, and the first session of the new Diet was opened by the Governor-General, Count van Limburg-Stirum, at the end of May.

The Diet was partly nominated and partly representative. It consisted of thirty-eight members, of whom nineteen were nominated by the Governor-General and nineteen were elected by the municipal and district councils. The membership of the first Diet was as follows: nineteen Europeans, ten Javanese, two Chinese, one Arab, two Malays, and four representatives of other races. The Diet was empowered to discuss the Budget and the military affairs of the colony, but its functions were, at the time of its institution, only consultative.

In view of the fact that the Netherlands East Indies, whose population was over 50,000,000, were much the most important tropical dependency possessed by any European nation except Great Britain, this development of constitutional life in the colony had considerable interest.

The Budget for 1918 showed a revenue of 32,172,350*l.* and an expenditure of 36,463,770*l.*

CHAPTER VII.

AFRICA: THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA—SOUTH-WEST AFRICA—RHODESIA — MADAGASCAR — PORTUGUESE EAST AFRICA — BRITISH AND GERMAN EAST AFRICA—LIBERIA—THE BELGIAN CONGO—NIGERIA—MOROCCO—ABYSSINIA—EGYPT—SUDAN.

THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA.

THE political situation in South Africa at the beginning of the year was substantially that which had existed from the beginning of the war. General Botha, the leader of the South African Party, was in power, but his followers were only a minority of the Lower House, and he owed his continuance in office to the support given him by the Unionist (or British) Party, notwith-

standing the fact that the Unionists had been formerly regarded as the official Opposition. The real Opposition was the Nationalist Party, the group of Boer extremists led by General Hertzog. The latter party had gained in influence in June, 1917, at the time of the elections for the provincial councils. The Nationalists were determined anti-Imperialists, and before the end of 1917 they had adopted the faith of Republicanism, seeking to sever connexion between South Africa and the British Empire.

The spring session of the South African Parliament was the occasion for much important legislative business. The Budget was introduced into the House of Assembly by Mr. Orr, the Finance Minister, on February 15. Mr. Orr stated that the revenue for the financial year 1917-18 was expected to amount to 19,409,000*l.*, which was 1,000,000*l.* in excess of the original estimate. He further stated that the revised estimate of the expenditure was 18,945,000*l.*, which was about 500,000*l.* in excess of the original estimate. The Finance Minister stated that the revenue from Customs, and also the Inland Revenue were largely in excess of what had been anticipated. Passing on to the Budget for 1918-19, Mr. Orr said that the estimated revenue was 19,256,000*l.*, and the estimated expenditure was 19,659,000*l.* The Railway Budget was introduced into the House of Assembly three days later by Mr. Burton, the Minister of Railways. It will be remembered that in South Africa the Railway Budget was entirely separate from the General Budget. Mr. Burton stated that the estimated expenditure for 1918-19 was 17,139,000*l.*, and the estimated revenue 16,170,000*l.*

Various important Acts were passed during the session. The attention of Parliament was directed towards industrial problems, owing to the fact that the war had occasioned a limitation of imports into South Africa, and had therefore necessitated an attempt on the part of South Africa to manufacture many articles for itself. It was a sign of this increased industrialism that a Regulation of Wages Act and a Factory Act were passed. During the session the question of Woman's Suffrage also arose, and certain politicians desired to see the principle of Woman's Suffrage included in an electoral Reform Bill. The motion in favour of Woman's Suffrage was, however, rejected in the Lower House by 54 votes against 39. Another Bill, having considerable importance, was passed relating to the mining rights possessed by the State in the East Rand. The Bill decided the terms upon which the Government could transfer to private corporations these mining rights which it possessed.

The year 1918 was a landmark in the educational progress of South Africa. It will be remembered that the universities and colleges of South Africa had been recently entirely re-organised, the old University of the Cape of Good Hope having been abolished. In the place of the old University, a Cape Town University, which was really the South African College enlarged

and improved and given University status, came into existence. The inaugural meeting of the University of Cape Town was held on April 2 in the University Hall, which had previously belonged to the old University of the Cape of Good Hope. Members of the Council, of the Senate, of the Professorial staff, and, of course, the students, were present, and an address was delivered by the Governor-General, Viscount Buxton. The Governor-General described to the audience the history of university education in South Africa, and he explained that the new university would be associated with the University of Stellenbosch which, as a university, was also newly established, and also with the University at Pretoria. Lord Buxton then referred to the generous financial support given to the new university by Messrs. Julius Wernher and Otto Beit. The Governor-General ended by reading a message of congratulation from the Prince of Wales. A speech was then delivered by the Minister of Education, Mr. F. S. Malan, who said that he hoped that both Dutch and English students would come to the new university, and would co-operate in the most cordial manner. The new University of Stellenbosch was inaugurated at the same time. This university was also a transformation and improvement of the old and well-known Stellenbosch College.

During the summer there was great unrest in most parts of South Africa, the unrest being of several totally distinct categories. There was, firstly, according to statements made by the Prime Minister, a seditious agitation on foot among the extreme Nationalists, and there were, apparently, plots concocted by these extremists to destroy the South African Constitution, and establish a Republic by violent means. It is fair to state, however, that General Hertzog himself, though adhering to the ideal of republicanism, constantly discouraged any idea of attaining that ideal by violent means. In the second place, there were strikes and disturbances among the white working classes. In particular, in Johannesburg there were threats of grave industrial trouble, caused especially by the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, but the strikes were averted at the last moment by large concessions on the part of the Town Council and other employers. In the third place the coloured labourers were affected by the general unrest, especially in the Transvaal, and the Johannesburg municipality were compelled to apply to the Government for troops to overawe the strikers. About seventy of the ringleaders were arrested.

The Census, which is taken in South Africa septennially, was taken once more this year. The total white population of the Union was given as 1,418,060, and the figures for the four large provinces were as follows:—

Cape Province, 580,771; Natal, 120,465; Transvaal, 497,236; Orange Free State, 181,292. The total white population of the Union seven years previously had been 1,276,242. The total coloured population of the Union was stated to be 5,400,000,

but this latter figure was evidently not exact. In seven years the coloured population was stated to have increased by nearly 1,400,000.

At the end of the summer South Africa was afflicted by a very severe epidemic of Spanish influenza.

At the end of the year approximate figures of the total South African casualties in the war were published. It was stated that 6,800 South Africans had been killed, of whom 4,630 had been killed in Europe. About 11,500 South Africans had been wounded or gassed. It was stated that out of about 1,800 deaths in the East African Campaign 1,200 had been due to disease.

The victorious conclusion of the war was, of course, greeted with the greatest enthusiasm by English-speaking South Africans, and by all the Boer Imperialists. But the members of the Nationalist Party took a somewhat different line. The Central Committees of the Nationalist Parties of all the four provinces sent a note to President Wilson, in which reference was made to the just principles which that statesman had so often set forth to the world. The note then referred with satisfaction to the fortunate cessation of bloodshed, but desired to lay before the President the aspiration of these Nationalist Parties that the principle of self-determination should be applied as much to the South African people as to other small nations.

THE COLONY OF SOUTH-WEST AFRICA.

The Colony of South-West Africa, recently belonging to Germany, continued to be occupied and administrated throughout the year by the Union of South Africa. After the conclusion of the armistice the German settlers in the colony, through the medium of their municipal authorities, sent a note to the President of the United States, asking for the application of the principle of self-determination to South-West Africa. The petition stated that the colonists desired to form an autonomous republic, leagued to the new German republic. The note also stated that the colonists believed that this solution would also meet the desires of the native peoples of the territory. There is no reason to doubt that this note represented the almost unanimous desire of the small white population of South-West Africa, but there was not the slightest reason to accept it as expressing the wishes of the natives.

RHODESIA.

This colony passed through a prosperous year, and continued to play an important part in the war in proportion to its small population. In the spring there was important litigation in reference to the legal position of the unalienated lands of Southern Rhodesia. This case was finally dealt with by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Lord Loreburn was President

of the Committee. There were four claimants to these lands, namely, the British South Africa Company, the elected members of the Legislative Council, the Natives, and, finally, the Crown. The unalienated land, which had formerly belonged to King Lobengula, amounted to no less than 114,000 square miles, of which, however, 33,000 square miles were set aside as native reserves. The hearing of the case lasted for several weeks, and the Judicial Committee did not deliver their report until July 29. The report declared that these unalienated lands were the property of the Crown, but it was declared that so long as the British South Africa Company continued to administer Southern Rhodesia, it was entitled to dispose of the unalienated lands. It was further stated that if and when the Crown took over the colony from the Chartered Company, the Company would be entitled to reimbursement for any advances made in connexion with the administration of the large territory. The importance of this case may be judged from the fact that it was estimated that the lands in question would be worth, within a few years, 300,000,000*l.* The twenty-second Ordinary General Meeting of the British South Africa Company was held a few days later, and Mr. P. Lyttleton Gell, who presided, explained that the ownership of Northern Rhodesia and the Company's interests in Nyasaland and Bechuanaland were not affected in any way by the Privy Council's decision; and the chairman then went on to explain that in point of fact the financial position of the Company had benefited by the Privy Council's decision.

The fifth session of the Legislative Council was opened by the Administrator, Sir D. Chaplin, on May 2. The Administrator stated that the chief concern of everybody during the year must be to assist the Imperial Government in the war, and he explained that owing to the conditions brought about by the war, it had been necessary for the administration of the territory to exercise the strictest economy of expenditure.

MADAGASCAR.

During the year news of considerable interest was received relating to this great French Colony. It was stated that Madagascar had profited commercially from the war, and that in recent years before the war and during the war the economic position of the island had greatly improved. Thus, the foreign trade of the island in the year 1913 was valued at 130,000,000 francs, and in 1917 it was valued at 223,000,000 francs, the value of the exports in the latter year being 86,000,000 francs. The export of timber was rapidly increasing, 3,000 metric tons having been exported in 1917. The most remarkable development during the war, however, was the extraordinary growth of the cattle industry. The cattle industry was new to Madagascar, but it was stated that by the end of 1918 there were 8,000,000 head of cattle in the island,

PORTUGUESE EAST AFRICA.

There were no important developments in this large colony during the year, and the territory remained in a sadly backward condition. The northern parts of Portuguese East Africa were affected by the war with Germany, for the German commander, General von Lettow, had been forced to flee from his own country into Portuguese territory; and in the wilder parts of this colony he succeeded in evading capture. In the spring the Governor-General of Mozambique, Dr. Alvaro de Castro, resigned, and he subsequently became implicated in plots against the President of Portugal, Senhor Paes. Colonel Massano Amorius was appointed Governor-General in the place of de Castro. Colonel Amorius was fifty-five years of age, and had been Governor of the district of Mozambique between 1906 and 1911.

BRITISH EAST AFRICA AND GERMAN EAST AFRICA.

It will be remembered that before the end of the year 1917, the serious operations against the great German colony in East Africa, which had been undertaken by General Smuts, had been brought to a successful conclusion, although the remnant of the German force had not been captured, and had succeeded in escaping over the border into Portuguese East Africa. The German force was still led by General von Lettow-Vorbeck. This commander was an able and determined soldier, and it was clearly his intention to hold out to the very end. Having regard to the size of the country and the density of the tropical forest, it was not surprising that the small German force succeeded in avoiding capture. The Germans were able to attack and sack plantations in various parts of the Portuguese colony, and during June and July they succeeded in doing serious material damage in the Mozambique province, particularly in the Raraga and Licungo valleys. One of the most serious actions occurred at the beginning of July at Nhamacurra, situated about twenty-five miles north of Quilimane. At this spot von Lettow fell in with a small British and Portuguese detachment, and severe fighting continued for three days. Later in the year von Lettow made his way farther north, and wandered about in Portuguese Nyasaland and into Rhodesia. Even in this region the German commander kept the field until after the conclusion of the armistice with Germany when, however, he duly surrendered. General von Lettow-Vorbeck surrendered on November 14 on the Chambezi River in Northern Rhodesia. The force which von Lettow kept together until the end consisted of only 150 European soldiers (30 officers), about 1,100 Askari soldiers, and some 3,000 carriers and camp followers. It was stated by the British that General von Lettow-Vorbeck had, throughout the campaign, adhered strictly to the laws of war,

In June it was announced that Major-General Edward Northey, who had been in command of the Nyasaland and Rhodesian contingent during the campaign against German East Africa, had been appointed Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the East Africa protectorate, and High Commissioner of the Zanzibar protectorate in succession to Sir H. C. Belfield. Later in the year a knighthood was conferred on General Northey.

A session of the B.E.A. Legislative Council was held early in the summer. Mr. P. H. Clarke delivered an address at the close of the session on behalf of the unofficial members, and he stated that he hoped that the Government would encourage production of local produce, more particularly the growth of wheat and rice, and the speaker also stated that the settlers desired an increase of popular representation in the government of the country.

LIBERIA.

On April 10 the capital of this republic, Monrovia, was bombarded by a German submarine. The submarine, in command of a Captain Gercke, suddenly appeared before the town, and the enemy boarded, and subsequently sank, the Liberian armed steamer, *President Howard*. Captain Gercke then made demands in regard to the destruction of the local wireless station, and when these demands had been refused by the authorities, the submarine opened a bombardment which lasted about half an hour. Four persons were killed and the wireless station was destroyed.

In issuing his annual address to the Legislature, the President, Mr. D. E. Howard, stated that all Germans had been deported from the country. The President stated that the condition of the local militia was not altogether satisfactory.

THE BELGIAN CONGO.

The development of this colony continued satisfactorily during the year. The Budget statement issued by the Financial Department showed that the revenue for 1918 was expected to amount to 57,939,360 francs, and the estimated expenditure was 64,988,327 francs. The anticipated deficit shown by these figures was very much smaller than in previous years.

NIGERIA.

The progress of Nigeria during the year was satisfactory. It was stated that the estimated revenue for 1918 was 3,210,104*l*. The revenue formerly derived from the trade in spirits had almost completely vanished, but the other taxes produced increased receipts, largely owing to the increase in prices of so many products.

MOROCCO.

Unrest continued to exist in the Spanish zone of Morocco, and it was believed that the disturbances were largely fomented by German intriguers. The great Chief Raisuli continued to exercise authority in his own sphere and remained quite independent of the Spanish authorities. Raisuli was in constant communication with Herr Bohn, the German Consul at Tetuan. Partly owing to these German intrigues, the unrest spread to the French zone, and in particular there was a serious rising during the summer by the tribesmen owing allegiance to Abdul Malek. The French, however, inflicted a serious defeat upon Abdul Malek's force north of Taza, and there was no general rebellion in the French zone.

ABYSSINIA.

There were no new disturbances in the Abyssinian Empire during the year, and the Empress Zeoditu remained on the throne, notwithstanding the fact that the deposed Emperor, Lidj Jeassu, was not captured. He was living with a small band of followers in the Dankalis country. King Mikrael, the father of Lidj Jeassu, was held in prison by the new authorities, but was not executed.

EGYPT.

The Egyptian protectorate passed through a quiet year so far as internal politics were concerned, the public interest being centred upon the campaign which was being waged in Palestine by the army which had advanced from the Suez Canal. This army was now under the command of General Allenby. It will be remembered that General Allenby had captured Jerusalem at the end of the previous year. The close connexion between Egypt and Palestine, which had arisen owing to the war, was symbolised in the union made in May, when a swing bridge was thrown across the Suez Canal at Kantara, thus opening up direct and continuous railway communication between Cairo and Jerusalem.

Considerable interest attached, as usual, to the Egyptian Budget statement. Dealing first with the figures for the year 1917-18, the actual revenue produced during that year was E. 23,166,074*l.*, and the actual expenditure for the twelve months was E. 22,496,948*l.* These figures were over E. 3,000,000*l.* in excess of the Budget estimates, and were also about E. 3,000,000*l.* (more in the case of the expenditure) in excess of the figures for the previous year. The revenue was the highest ever known in the history of Egypt. The expenditure was also greater than in any previous year, but this included a contribution made

by the Egyptian Government to the British war expenses, this contribution amounting to E. 2,967,956*l.*, and thus the State expenditure of the protectorate, as shown above, ought really to be reduced by this figure. On the side of the revenue, the customs increased by nearly E. 500,000*l.*, and the railway receipts by over E. 500,000*l.*, and there was also an increase under the head of "exemption from military service." Turning next to the estimates for the year 1918-19, the Budget, as approved by the Council of Ministers at the end of March, provided for an expenditure of E. 23,250,000*l.*, and the estimated revenue was E. 22,900,000*l.* Of the new taxes to be imposed, the most important was a new Sugar Excise, which was expected to account for E. 634,000*l.* This Budget expenditure included the sum of E. 500,000*l.* for military expenditure incurred in Egypt.

The chief events in the campaign in Palestine occurred at the very end of the war, and during the earlier months of the year there were no very important military developments in that country. At the end of March, General Allenby announced that his advanced troops had crossed the Jordan, but for some weeks after this, the operations on the farther side of the Jordan were not very successful. Early in May the advanced detachment advanced towards Es Salt, but they were surprised by a superior force, and the British Horse Artillery were compelled to beat a precipitate retreat and abandon nine guns. At the end of September, however, General Allenby's forces had a dramatic and thorough revenge. The British then executed a sudden advance, and the operations were planned with such skill that the Turkish Army in Palestine was almost completely destroyed. Before the advance the British line ran from the coast a little north of Arsuf eastwards to the mouth of the Aujeh, and then along the Jordan as far as the Dead Sea, crossings of the Jordan being held at certain spots.

The great attack began on the morning of September 19 on the western part of the line, the enemy being apparently taken by surprise. British Yeomanry Regiments, and Australian and Indian Cavalry were concentrated in the coastal sector, and these poured through the defences that were broken by the artillery, and advanced rapidly with the object of cutting off the retreat of the Turks. The cavalry captured the town of Nazareth on the following day, with over 2,000 prisoners. Further to the British right the infantry also succeeded in their frontal attack, and by the evening of September 20 the Turkish line from the sea to the Jordan had totally collapsed. The rapid advance of the British left wing composed of cavalry had cut off the retreat of the Turks to the north; and in the meantime the cavalry of the King of the Hejaz carried out a most important and successful operation east of the Jordan. Avoiding the formidable Turkish force at Amman, the Arab horsemen attacked and damaged the railway line at the junction of Deraa, thus cutting the communication between the Turkish troops and their base,

which was at Damascus. Even after this had occurred, the British had some difficulty in crossing the Jordan in force, and this was not accomplished until September 22. And on September 23 the British took the town of Es Salt, which had been taken and lost twice during the war. The Turkish Army was now placed in an extremely perilous position, largely owing to the skilful operations of the Arab cavalry. On September 29 10,000 Turks surrendered about 15 miles south of Amman station, and on October 1 Damascus was occupied by the British, 7,000 more prisoners being captured. A few days later Beyrout was captured. The Arab forces, which were under the command of the King's son, the Emir Feisul, reached Damascus on October 3. The Emir Feisul was immediately appointed Military Governor of the city. Before the end of October General Allenby's troops reached Aleppo, which was a fitting termination to these brilliantly planned operations.

During the year, further and more exact particulars were published in regard to the Egyptian census taken in 1917 (see A.R., 1917, p. 307). Thus, the total population of Cairo was given as 790,939, with a slight excess of men over women. The foreign population of Cairo was considerable, and included 8,252 French, 7,524 British, 15,655 Italians, 15,254 Greeks, and 12,081 Turks; the other nationalities being much less numerous. The population of Alexandria, including the suburb of Ramleh, was given as 444,617, and in this city also there was a slight excess of males over females.

SUDAN.

The year was very uneventful in Sudan, and no internal disturbances or wars with the neighbouring tribes have to be recorded. The new Sudanese province of Darfur was peacefully developed under the Sudanese Government, and the natives of this recently annexed territory appear to have been quite content with the new régime. In the Budget for the year 1918, the revenue and expenditure were estimated to balance at E. 2,255,000*l.*, a figure which was over E. 400,000*l.* in excess of that relating to the previous year. The chief increase on the side of the revenue was under the head of Provincial Receipts (which included Land Taxes and Traders Taxes), and on the side of expenditure there was an increase in the shape of War Gratuities, and in the cost of taking over the expense of the administration of Darfur from the Egyptian Government.

CHAPTER VIII.

AMERICA : THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ITS DEPENDENCIES — CANADA — NEWFOUNDLAND — MEXICO — BRAZIL — ARGENTINA — CHILI — THE MINOR REPUBLICS OF SOUTH AMERICA.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ITS DEPENDENCIES.

THE entry of the United States into the European War in April, 1917, gave that country a commanding position in the world. The Americans began immediately to make their preparations for entering the conflict, and these preparations were planned upon an unprecedented scale. A scheme of compulsory military service, involving ten million men, was adopted. Naval assistance was immediately given to Great Britain, particularly in the matter of providing small warships adapted for the destruction of submarines. Plans were made for building large numbers of merchant vessels. Great and systematic efforts were made to send food to the European Allies. And, not the least important form of assistance, the stupendous financial strength of the United States was made available for the support of the now much impoverished European Powers.

The United States did not become formally allied to the Powers of Western Europe. It will be remembered that the consent of the Senate was necessary to the conclusion of an alliance, and the Executive appear to have thought that a formal instrument of alliance was unsuited to the existing circumstances. In practice, however, the Republic became most intimately associated with Great Britain, France, and Italy, and the most notable feature of the situation, as it developed, was the extraordinary concentration of powers in the hands of the President, Dr. Woodrow Wilson. The President possessed the implicit confidence of the great majority of his countrymen, and it was with general approval that he acquired almost dictatorial powers. Nor was it only in his own country that President Wilson was seen to occupy a position of peculiar eminence. His statements of the political and moral issues of the war had been at once concise, clear, and philosophical, and he was regarded as one of the very greatest, if not the greatest, of the leaders of democracy, both by Americans and by Liberals in Europe.

On January 8 President Wilson delivered a message to Congress, which defined in considerable detail the war-aims of America. The message opened by a reference to the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk, the President condemning the concrete demands of the Central Powers as involving nothing short of annexation. The speaker said that it was impossible to know for whom the delegations of the Central Powers were really speaking, whether for the Liberal majorities in the German and Austrian parliaments or for the militarist minorities in those

countries. He suggested that conflict and confusion existed, and that the general principles laid down (which seemed not unjust) were those of the Liberals, but that the practical applications had been dictated by the militarists. There was, however, a clear call to state once more the aims of America, and this duty was owed, in particular, to the sorely stricken Russian people.

"It would be necessary," said Dr. Wilson, "that the future peace terms should be absolutely open and public. There should be no secret agreements.

"The programme of the world's peace, therefore, is our programme, and that programme, the only possible one as we see it, is this :—

"I. Open covenants of peace openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

"II. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas outside territorial waters alike in peace and in war except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

"III. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers, and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

"IV. Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

"V. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the Government whose title is to be determined.

"VI. The evacuation of all Russian territory, and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest co-operation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy, and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their goodwill, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

"VII. Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No

other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is for ever impaired.

"VIII. All French territory should be freed, and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly fifty years, should be righted in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

"IX. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognisable lines of nationality.

"X. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

"XI. Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated, occupied territories restored, Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea, and the relations of the several Balkan States to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality, and international guarantees of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan States should be entered into.

"XII. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

"XIII. An independent Polish State should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

"XIV. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small States alike."

In adhering to this programme, the President said he felt sure that he was in perfect accord with the other Powers associated together "against the Imperialists." There was no jealousy of German greatness. "Neither do we presume to suggest to her any alteration or modification of her institutions." But it was necessary to know for whom her spokesmen spoke, whether for the Reichstag majority or for the military party and the men whose creed was Imperial domination. For the principles outlined the people of the United States were ready

to devote their lives, their honour, and everything they possessed. .

The public discussion of possible terms of peace by the statesmen of the belligerent Powers, which was such a novel feature of the world's political situation during the first ten weeks of the year, was continued by President Wilson in an address to Congress delivered on February 11. President Wilson began by stating that the speech made by himself on January 8, and that delivered by the Prime Minister of Great Britain on January 5, had now been answered by the German Chancellor, and the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Secretary, both speaking on January 24. "Count Czernin's reply was," said Dr. Wilson, "very friendly in tone. He is represented to have intimated that the views he was expressing had been communicated to me beforehand, and that I was aware of them at the time he was uttering them. But in this I am sure he was misunderstood. I had received no intimation of what he intended to say. There was, of course, no reason why he should communicate previously with me. I am quite content to be one of his public audience." President Wilson went on to say that Count Hertling's speech was much less satisfactory in tone, and that it had unfortunately confirmed the impression made by the conferences at Brest-Litovsk. In particular, the Chancellor had seemed very jealous of international action generally; he would discuss with nobody but Russia what should happen to the peoples of the Baltic provinces, with nobody but the Austro-Hungarian Government what should be the fate of Poland, and with none save the Government at Paris as to what the conditions should be on which French territory should be evacuated. Count Hertling had, in fact, proposed the adoption of the method of the Congress of Vienna. "We cannot and will not return to that. What is at stake now is the peace of the world. What we are striving for is a new international order based upon the broad and universal principles of right and justice—no more peace of shreds and patches." Count Hertling had, said Dr. Wilson, deserted the standpoint of the Reichstag peace resolution of July 19, 1917. For that resolution had frankly accepted the idea of a general international peace. Such a general peace "cannot be pieced together out of individual understandings between powerful States." Nevertheless, the United States had no desire to act as arbiter in European territorial disputes; she only endeavoured to lay down the general principles upon which it appeared essential that any permanent peace must be based. Count Hertling had seen that just conditions of trade could not be assured by separate and selfish agreements between individual States, but he ought also to endeavour to realise that, similarly, separate and selfish compacts with regard to provinces and peoples ought to be condemned.

Dr. Wilson spoke in a very friendly manner of Count Czernin's speech. Count Czernin had realised the necessity for

an independent Poland made up of all the indisputably Polish territories, situated contiguously to one another, and he had seen at once the necessity of evacuating and restoring Belgium. If Count Czernin had avoided references to matters which touched Austria-Hungary's allies rather than herself, this was clearly due to the necessity laid upon him of deferring to the susceptibilities of Germany and Turkey. The Foreign Minister would probably have gone much further except for the unfortunate embarrassments created by the Dual Monarchy's alliances.

The speaker then laid down four principles which ought to be applied to these questions :—

“First : That each part of the final settlement must be based upon the essential justice of that particular case and upon such adjustments as are most likely to bring a peace that will be permanent.

“Second : That peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were mere chattels and pawns in a game, even the great game now for ever discredited, of the balance of power ; but that

“Third : Every territorial settlement involved in this war must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned, and not as a part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims amongst rival States.

“Fourth : That all well-defined national aspirations shall be accorded the utmost satisfaction that can be accorded them without introducing new, or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonism that would be likely in time to break the peace of Europe, and consequently, of the world.”

Dr. Wilson went on to say that these principles were undoubtedly essential to a permanent peace, and that the tragedy was that they were accepted everywhere, except by the spokesman of the military party in Germany. Until such terms could be obtained the people of the United States had no choice but to continue the war.

On April 6th, the anniversary of the American entry into the war, President Wilson delivered an important speech at Baltimore. America had entered the war in order that men everywhere might be free. The issues of the war had become more clear as the conflict had continued. He had endeavoured not to judge the purposes of Germany intemperately ; and when the time for final reckoning came he would endeavour to see justice done to the German people. Nevertheless, the purposes of the German State had become increasingly clear. The avowal of Germany's sinister purposes had come, not from her statesmen, but from her military leaders who were her real rulers. Even at Brest-Litovsk the civilian statesmen had professed some moderation, but the subsequent actions of the German military power had been utterly ruthless. Was it not reasonable to believe that in the west they would act in the same manner if they were not there faced by armies which they

could not overcome. It was clearly the object of Berlin to dominate all the Slavic peoples, the Balkan Peninsula and Turkey, and thus eventually to master Persia, India, and even the Far East. If that programme were carried out successfully there would be no alternative for America, and for any people who dared to stand by her, but to arm, and begin the ancient struggle for freedom all over again. The German armies were the armies of tyranny. What, then, was to be done? For himself, said the speaker, he was willing to accept a just peace at any time. But when he proposed such a peace, the answer had come from the German commanders in Russia. President Wilson said that he accepted the challenge and knew that his hearers would accept it. "All the world shall know that you accept it. It shall appear in the utter sacrifice and self-forgetfulness with which we shall give all that we love and all that we have, to redeem the world and make it fit for free men like ourselves to live in." Germany had once more said that force should decide whether right or domination should prevail. "There is, therefore, but one response possible from us: force, force to the utmost, force without stint or limit, the righteous and triumphant force which shall make right the law of the world and cast every selfish dominion down in the dust."

In February a Bill was introduced by Senator Overman with the object of giving the President greater executive powers during the war. The President was, by the terms of this Bill, "authorised and empowered to make such redistribution of his functions among executive agencies as he may deem necessary, including any functions, duties, and powers hitherto by law conferred upon any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, office or officer, in such manner as in his judgment shall seem best fitted to carry out the purposes of this Act." The amendments made in the processes of American government by this Bill were intricate and detailed, but were of great importance for the prosecution of the war. The Bill met with considerable opposition in the Senate, chiefly from Republicans, but also from a few Democrats. But it was passed by the Senate at the end of April, and was subsequently passed by the House of Representatives.

The preparations made by the United States Government for the prosecution of the war were on such a scale that it is not too much to say that they were the greatest war preparations in the whole history of the world. All the energy of the enormous population of the United States was thrown into these preparations. It will be remembered that a Conscription Act, taking the form of a compulsory selective draft, was passed immediately after the declaration of war. And even this first Act, which made only men between the ages of 21 and 30 liable for military service, necessitated the registration of about 9,500,000 men. Voluntary enlistment continued for the Regular Army and also for the National Guard, the latter force

having been taken over by the Federal Government from the States. Twelve months after America entered the war, the Regular Army (the strength of which had been only 130,000 before the war) had been raised to 513,000 officers and men. And the National Guard (the strength of which had been 150,000 before the war, many of the men inefficient) numbered at the end of the first year nearly 450,000 men. In addition to these increases, the Conscription Act brought in 645,000 men during the seven months September, 1917, to March, 1918.

As already stated, the first Conscription Act rendered nearly 10,000,000 men liable for military service, although, of course, in practice, deductions would have to be made for the unfit, and for other reasons. During the last seven months of the war these conscripts were called up with great rapidity, and the American military effort was stimulated by the reverses suffered by the Allies during the spring. During the summer months men were rushed across to France at the rate of about 250,000 per month. And in the month of September it was stated that no fewer than 311,000 American soldiers had landed in Europe. As stated elsewhere (see War), in the spring permission was given by the American Government for the American troops to be brigaded with the more experienced British and French troops, but by the end of the summer a large separate American Army, under General Pershing, was in existence, and this American Army carried out successful operations in the southern portion of the Western Front. It was stated that up to the end of September, when the American Government entered into the preliminary negotiations with Germany, no fewer than 1,766,160 American troops had been sent to Europe; and by the same date over 3,000,000 men had volunteered or been called up. It is of some interest to record that of the troops carried to Europe, 59 per cent had been carried in British ships or in ships controlled by Great Britain.

Even these figures give only an inadequate idea of the potential military strength of the United States. In August a Bill was passed by Congress widening the limits of the military age for conscripts, the new limits to be 18 and 45. It was stated that this new Conscription Bill, which had a rapid passage through Congress, rendered 13,000,000 more men liable for service, so that altogether over 22,000,000 men were rendered liable. The men coming under the terms of the new Conscription Act were registered on September 12. It was stated that the recruits of the "First Class" would be selected from men between the ages of 19 and 36.

Fortunately it was not necessary to throw more than a small percentage of this potential American Army into the conflagration. At the end of November the total American casualties in the war were made known. These were as follows:—

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------|
| Killed | - | - | - | - | - | - | 36,154 |
| Died of disease and through other causes | - | - | - | - | - | - | 17,015 |
| Wounded | - | - | - | - | - | - | 179,625 |
| Prisoners and Missing | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8,828 |
| | | | | | | | <u>236,117</u> |

It was stated that the American troops captured 44,000 prisoners and 1,400 guns.

The naval effort of the United States was also very considerable. In the spring it was stated that nearly 300 destroyers of the largest type were being built, and at the same time nearly 400 submarine-chasers were being built. The American Admiralty concentrated chiefly upon building these smaller war-ships, since the superiority of the Entente in the larger ships was already very great. The personnel of the United States Navy was increased during the first twelve months from 73,000 to over 300,000. The American shipbuilding yards were also extraordinarily active, and it was stated that the ships built during 1918 would aggregate nearly 3,000,000 tons.

The efforts made by the United States on the side of finance were no less remarkable than the military statistics given above. It will be remembered that two "Liberty Loans" were issued during 1917, the second of these producing a sum of no less than 923,000,000*l.* A third "Liberty Loan" was issued at the end of April, and the total subscription to this Loan aggregated 835,303,370*l.*, and the total number of subscribers was 18,308,325. A fourth loan was issued shortly before the conclusion of the armistice. Turning to the figures of revenue and expenditure, it was reported that the total expenditure of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, was 2,716,360,494*l.* Provision had been made during that year for the expenditure of over 1,000,000,000*l.* in addition to the actual expenditure incurred. It was estimated that if the war continued until June 30, 1919, the expenditure of the United States in that fiscal year would be nearly 6,000,000,000*l.* The taxation of the country was increased to an enormous extent, as will be realised when it is stated that the Government expected to raise 1,600,000,000*l.* by taxation in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

In the middle of September, at the same time as the German peace proposal to Belgium, the Austro-Hungarian Government issued a general proposal for a Peace Conference, the proposal being sent to all the Governments at war with Austria-Hungary, the chief importance being attached, however, to the Note sent to the American Government (see Austria-Hungary). The American reply to this Austro-Hungarian proposal was issued with extreme promptitude by Mr. Lansing, the Secretary of State, on September 16. Mr. Lansing said that he was authorised to state that the American reply would be as follows:—

"The Government of the United States feels that there is only one reply which it can make to the suggestion of the Imperial Austro-Hungarian Government. It has repeatedly and with entire candour stated the terms upon which the United States would consider peace, and can and will entertain no proposal for a conference upon a matter concerning which it has made its position and purpose so plain." The American reply was said to have been issued within half an hour of the receipt of the Austro-Hungarian Note.

On September 27 President Wilson delivered a speech in New York, dealing once more in a general manner with the question of peace terms. The occasion was the opening of the fourth American "Liberty Loan," as the fourth War Loan was called. President Wilson said that as the war progressed the issues which were involved became increasingly clear. The issues were not made by any individual statesmen, but arose out of the very nature of the war. The issues which had arisen, said Dr. Wilson, were these: Shall a powerful military nation be allowed to determine the fortunes of a weaker nation over whom it has no right to rule except the right of force? Shall peoples be ruled even in their internal affairs by arbitrary force or by their own will? "Shall the assertion of right be haphazard and by casual alliance, or shall there be common concert to oblige the observance of common rights?" The President then went on to deal with the question of a League of Nations, and said how impossible it was to deal with the existing military rulers of Germany. The peace, said President Wilson, would have to be guaranteed, and the reason it would have to be guaranteed was that there would be parties to the peace who had in the past proved untrustworthy. The President then once more laid down five more propositions dealing with the proposed terms of peace. These five conditions were as follows:—

"1. The impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just. It must be a justice that knows no favourites and knows no standards but the equal rights of the several peoples concerned.

"2. No special or separate interest of any single nation or any group of nations can be made the basis of any part of the settlement which is not consistent with the common interest of all.

"3. There can be no leagues or alliances, or special covenants or understandings within the general and common family of the League of Nations.

"4. And more specifically, there can be no special selfish economic combinations within the League, and no employment of any form of economic boycott or exclusion except as the power of economic penalty by exclusion from the markets of the world, may be vested in the League of Nations itself as a means of discipline and control.

"5. All international agreements and treaties of every kind must be made known in their entirety to the rest of the world."

The President then went on to deal with the special position of the United States in regard to the proposed League of Nations. He dealt more specially with the traditional American policy of political isolation founded upon George Washington's condemnation of "entangling alliances." President Wilson said, "We still read Washington's immortal warning against entangling alliances, and with full comprehension and an answering purpose. But only special and limited alliances entangle; and we recognise and accept the duty of a new day in which we are permitted to hope for a general alliance which will avoid entanglements and clear the air of the world for common understandings and the maintenance of common rights." At the end of his speech President Wilson dealt with the recent German peace proposals. "Germany," he said, "is constantly intimating the 'terms' she will accept, and always finds that the world does not want terms of peace; it wishes the final triumph of justice and fair dealing."

During October the American Government entered into preliminary peace negotiations with the German and Austro-Hungarian Governments. The negotiations consisted only in the exchange of public Notes. The German Government preferred to deal with the American Government rather than with the Governments of the European Allies, as it was supposed in Germany that terms more favourable to the Central Powers could be obtained from President Wilson than would be likely to be granted by the European Powers acting on their own initiative.¹ The reply of the American Government to the first German Note was issued on October 8, and was addressed to Prince Maximilian of Baden, through the medium of the Swiss Chargé d'Affaires:—

"Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge, on behalf of the President, your Note of October 6, enclosing a communication from the German Government to the President; and I am instructed by the President to request you to make the following communication to the Imperial German Chancellor:—

"Before making a reply to the request of the Imperial German Government, and in order that the reply shall be as candid and straightforward as the momentous interests involved require, the President of the United States deems it necessary to assure himself of the exact meaning of the Note of the Imperial Chancellor. Does the Imperial Chancellor mean that the Imperial German Government accepts the terms laid down by the President in his address to the Congress of the United States on January 8 last and in subsequent addresses, and that

¹ The description of these preliminary negotiations, from the side of the two Central Powers, will be found in Chapter II.

its object in entering into discussions would be only to agree upon the practical details of their application? The President feels bound to say, with regard to the suggestion of an armistice, that he would not feel at liberty to propose a cessation of arms to the Governments with which the Government of the United States is associated against the Central Powers so long as the Armies of those Powers are upon their soil. The good faith of any discussion would manifestly depend upon the consent of the Central Powers immediately to withdraw their forces everywhere from invaded territory.

"The President also feels that he is justified in asking whether the Imperial Chancellor is speaking merely for the constituted authorities of the Empire who have so far conducted the war. He deems the answer to these questions vital from every point of view.

"Accept, Sir, the renewed assurances of my high consideration. (Signed) Robert Lansing."

The German Government replied promptly to this first American Note (see Germany). The second American Note, in reply to the German Note of October 12, was issued on October 14. This second Note was of considerable length. Mr. Lansing stated that since the German Government and the majority of the Reichstag had accepted the terms laid down by the President on January 8 and in subsequent addresses, President Wilson could now make a frank statement in reply to the German communications of October 5 and October 12. It was stated that any conditions of an armistice, or conditions relating to the process of evacuation, must be left to the judgment of the military advisers of the Associated Governments, and would have to provide "absolutely satisfactory safeguards and guarantees of the maintenance of the present military supremacy of the Armies of the United States and of the Allies in the field." Further, an armistice could not be considered until the illegal and inhuman practices of the German forces were abandoned. The Note then went on to call attention to a statement made by President Wilson on July 4 in regard to one of the necessary conditions of peace, which was as follows: "The destruction of every arbitrary power anywhere that can separately, secretly, and of its single choice disturb the peace of the world; or if it cannot be presently destroyed, at least its reduction to virtual impotency." The Note then stated that the German Government was such a power as was here described. The whole process of peace would depend upon the character of the guarantees which could be given upon this question. "It is indispensable that the Governments associated against Germany should know beyond a peradventure with whom they are dealing."

The Note was signed by Mr. Lansing.

The next Note issued by the American Government was addressed to the Austro-Hungarian Government through the

medium of the Swedish Minister, and was a reply to the Austro-Hungarian Note sent at the beginning of October. The Austro-Hungarian Government had asked for a general armistice, and had declared that it was prepared to accept the terms of peace laid down by President Wilson on January 8, February 12, and September 27. The American reply was dated October 18 and was published on October 19. It was addressed to the Swedish Minister. The Note was as follows:—

“ Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Note of the 7th inst. in which you transmit a communication of the Imperial and Royal Government of Austria-Hungary to the President. I am now instructed by the President to request you to be good enough, through your Government, to convey to the Imperial and Royal Government the following reply:—

“ The President deems it his duty to say to the Austro-Hungarian Government that he cannot entertain the present suggestion of that Government because of certain events of the utmost importance which, occurring since the delivery of his address of January 8 last, have necessarily altered the attitude and responsibility of the Government of the United States. Among the fourteen terms of peace which the President formulated at that time occurred the following:—

“ ‘ The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.’ Since that sentence was written and uttered to the Congress of the United States, the Government of the United States has recognised that a state of belligerency exists between the Czecho-Slovaks and the German and Austro-Hungarian Empires, and that the Czecho-Slovak National Council is a *de facto* belligerent Government, clothed with proper authority to direct the military and political affairs of the Czecho-Slovaks.

“ It has also recognised in the fullest manner the justice of the nationalistic aspirations of the Yugo-Slavs for freedom. The President is therefore no longer at liberty to accept a mere ‘ autonomy ’ of these peoples as a basis of peace, but is obliged to insist that they, and not he, shall be the judges of what action on the part of the Austro-Hungarian Government will satisfy their aspirations and their conception of their rights and destiny as members of the family of nations.

“ Accept, Sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration. (Signed) Robert Lansing.”

The chief interest and importance of this Note resided in the fact that the American Government were no longer prepared to consider that the granting of autonomy under the Habsburgs was a satisfactory solution of the problems presented by the subject nationalities of Austria and Hungary; but now demanded that these subject nationalities should be granted absolute independence.

In reply to the second American Note, Prince Maximilian of

Baden issued promptly a third Note, dated October 20. The third American Note to Germany was issued on October 23. The preamble stated that since the American terms, more particularly those enunciated on January 8, and on September 27, had been accepted by the German Government, and since the American Government had been assured that the German Government now represented the majority of the Reichstag and the majority of the German nation, and since the German Government had now declared that they would observe the rules of civilised warfare, the President could not "decline to take up with the Governments with which the Government of the United States is associated, the question of an armistice." The Note then went on to declare that the only armistice which could be considered would be one which would leave the Associated Powers in a position to enforce the terms which might be entered into and which would make "a renewal of hostilities on the part of Germany impossible." It was then stated that the President had transmitted the correspondence with the new German Government to the Governments associated with the Government of the United States, with the suggestion that if those Governments were disposed to effect peace upon the terms and principles indicated, the military advisers of all the Associated Governments should draw up such terms of an armistice as might seem to them necessary, in order that the Associated Governments might have the power to enforce the details of the proposed peace. "Should such terms of armistice be suggested, their acceptance by Germany will afford the best concrete evidence of her unequivocal acceptance of the terms and principles of peace from which the whole action proceeds." The Note then went on to criticise the inadequate character of the Constitutional changes which had recently been hurriedly brought about in Germany; and stated that at present it was "evident that the German people have no means of commanding the acquiescence of the military authorities of the Empire in the popular will, that the power of the King of Prussia to control the policy of the Empire is unimpaired, and that the determining initiative still remains with those who have hitherto been the masters of Germany." It was further declared that the peoples of the world did not trust the word of those who had hitherto been the masters of German policy, and that the Government of the United States could not deal with any but "veritable representatives of the German people." Lastly, it was declared that "if it" (the American Government) "must deal with the military masters and the monarchical autocrats of Germany now, or if it is likely to have to deal with them later in regard to the international obligations of the German Empire, it must demand, not peace negotiations, but surrender. Nothing can be gained by leaving this essential thing unsaid."

After Prince Maximilian's Government had thus been compelled to agree to the American terms, the negotiations were

short. The European Allies agreed to President Wilson's Fourteen Points with two qualifications, and the terms of an armistice with Germany were thereupon concluded (see European War).

On November 5 there was a legislative General Election in the United States, the whole of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Senate being elected. The issues before the voters were not of a very fundamental character. There could not be said to be any very serious difference of opinion between the two parties on the question of the war. On the whole the Democratic Party were more enthusiastic for the principle of a League of Nations than were the Republicans, but, on the other hand, Mr. Taft and many other leading Republicans were no less in favour of the international ideal than were the Democrats. Dr. Wilson issued an appeal to the electorate to return a Democratic Congress, in order to strengthen his hands in the conclusion of the war and in the peace settlement. The Republicans, notably Mr. Roosevelt and Senator Lodge, replied by criticising many of the items in the President's Fourteen Points, and also by criticising his domestic policy, which they deemed too socialistic. In the result, the small Democratic majority was converted into a small Republican majority in both Houses. In the House of Representatives the Republicans were returned with a clear majority of sixteen. The Governors and legislatures of many of the States were elected at the same time. The Democratic candidate for the Governorship of New York City, a certain Mr. Smith, was elected by a considerable plurality. In many of the States women possessed votes, and it was reported that 8,000,000 women were on the electoral rolls.

At the end of November one of the most distinguished members of Dr. Wilson's Cabinet, Mr. McAdoo, the Secretary of the Treasury, resigned his office. It was stated that the resignation was due merely to Mr. McAdoo's private affairs.

After the conclusion of the armistice it was arranged that President Wilson should visit Europe before the end of the year. This was the first occasion on which the American President had left the territory of the federation during his term of office, and the plan was somewhat severely criticised by Dr. Wilson's political opponents. On December 2, on the eve of his departure for Europe, President Wilson addressed a joint session of Congress. Dr. Wilson stated that pending a fundamental change in international relationships, the American naval programme would be carried out. The President stated that he regarded it as his duty to attend the Peace Conference in order "to make good what the American soldiers have offered their life's blood to obtain." The speech was enthusiastically cheered by the Democrats. The President sailed from New York on the liner *George Washington* on December 4. The vessel had a large escort of warships. Dr. Wilson was accompanied by Mr. Lansing and many other advisers and by

his wife. The President landed at Brest on December 12, and was received in Paris on the following day. The American President was received with every formality by M. Poincaré, and speeches were delivered by Dr. Wilson and the leading French statesmen on the triumph of democracy in the war. At the end of December Dr. Wilson proceeded to London, landing in England on December 26. On that day he was received by King George, and he remained in England nearly a week (see English History).

During Dr. Wilson's absence his policy was severely criticised by the leading Republicans, more particularly by Senator Lodge, who made a long speech in the Senate on December 20. Senator Lodge criticised several of the more important of the Fourteen Points. In particular, Mr. Lodge was opposed to the President's policy of the "Freedom of the Seas," and said that neither Great Britain nor the United States could afford to abandon the right of naval blockade. Mr. Lodge also criticised Dr. Wilson's proposal to abolish special tariff walls. The Senator thought, moreover, that an attempt to form a League of Nations at the present time might lead to embarrassing discussions between the various Associated Powers.

CANADA.

During the year 1917 the political situation in Canada had undergone fundamental changes. The historic alignment of parties had been completely upset by the development of politics caused by the war. In Canada, as in other parts of the British Empire, as the war proceeded and the strain upon manpower became greater, the question of introducing compulsory military service came to the fore. And in Canada the disturbances created by this question were more complex and acute by reason of the existence of the French province of Quebec. In Canada, unlike Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand, the advocates of conscription had to face not only the traditional objections of Liberals and Labour politicians to the principle of compulsory service, but had also to encounter the hostility, and indeed the intense antagonism, of a foreign population which was almost entirely out of sympathy with the British Empire on the question of the war. It is strange at first sight that this opposition should have existed in Quebec. It might have been supposed that the French colony would have exhibited spontaneous sympathy with France. But it must be remembered that Quebec had been colonised by the old Royalist Catholic France and that it had been lost to that country before the great Revolution; and hence owing to the complete break in French history caused by that event the people of Quebec were in reality naturally antipathetic rather than naturally sympathetic to the people of modern Republican France. Moreover, the people of the province lived a singularly isolated

life and were peculiarly ignorant of the developments of world-politics.

The Prime Minister, Sir Robert Borden, when he returned from England in the summer of 1917 had announced that the need for man-power had become very extreme, and that in consequence he had resolved to do his utmost to introduce compulsory military service into Canada. And he made an appeal to the leaders of the Liberal Opposition, and more particularly to Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself, to co-operate with the Government in instituting the new system of service. After much discussion by the different sections of the Opposition, the Liberal Party was rent in twain by this appeal. The Premier and nearly all the leading Conservatives were much impressed with the urgency of the problem, and they decided to push through a Bill embodying the principle of conscription without any appeal to the electorate. Sir Wilfrid Laurier contended that this was a wholly undemocratic procedure, since the principle of obligatory military service for a foreign war was wholly new in Canada. In spite of the opposition of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the less severe criticism of most of the other Liberals, the Conscription Bill was duly passed and became law in the month of August. Moreover, this was followed by a further success for Sir Robert Borden. In October he succeeded in inducing all the most important of the English-speaking Liberals to break with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and to form with the leading Conservatives a Coalition Government, with the object of carrying through conscription with as little friction as possible, and of generally prosecuting the war in a still more vigorous manner. At this time all the four Western provinces had Liberal Governments, but all these four Governments agreed to support Sir Robert Borden's policy. Hence it became clear early in the autumn that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was left with very little influential support outside Quebec. Parliament, whose life had already been prolonged owing to the war, was dissolved by the Governor-General at the beginning of October and a General Election was held in December. This had become necessary owing to the refusal of the Opposition to agree to any further prolongation of the life of the Legislature. The result of the elections was a great victory for the Coalition Government, but the success of the Unionists notoriously arose very largely from the fact that the Government had bestowed the federal vote upon the female relatives of soldiers, but not upon women generally. The Government were returned with a majority of no less than 70 in the Lower House. The Liberals, however, had secured an overwhelming majority in Quebec, where only three constituencies returned Unionists. The Government possessed a small majority in the Atlantic provinces, but it was in Ontario and the four Western provinces that the Unionists were strongest. In Ontario, Sir Wilfrid Laurier's supporters only won eight seats, and in the

four Western provinces only two constituencies returned Liberals. The Canadian Army voted overwhelmingly for the Government. It was stated that the military electors supported the Government by a majority of 206,626 against 15,016. The total vote for the Government was about 1,047,000 and the total vote for the Liberals was about 697,000. About 62,000 votes were given to Labour and Independent candidates.

The passing of the Conscription Act in the previous year, and the partial manner in which the federal vote had been bestowed upon women, caused much discontent in Quebec. And in the middle of January, Mr. J. N. Francoeur introduced a motion into the Lower House of the Quebec Parliament, advocating the secession of Quebec from the confederation, if the other provinces felt that the people of Quebec were obstructing the natural destiny of those other provinces. The resolution was seconded by Mr. La Ferté, and was strongly opposed by the leader of the Opposition, Mr. A. Sauvé. The feeling of the House was clearly against the resolution. On January 24, Sir Lomer Gouin, the Prime Minister, intervened in the debate and made a long speech. Sir Lomer Gouin dissented from a proposal made by Mr. Sauvé, that Quebec should petition the British Government to disallow the Conscription Act, as he stated that he was certain that this would only raise vain hopes in the hearts of the people of Quebec. The Premier was, he said, in favour of the system of federal government for Canada. It was true that Quebec had been insulted in the other provinces, but these insults did not represent the sentiments of the majority of the inhabitants of the English provinces. The Premier closed his speech with an eloquent peroration on the past benefits of confederation, and on the hopes of the Canadian Dominion in the twentieth century. After the Prime Minister's speech, Mr. Francoeur withdrew his motion, and said that he had no wish to see a rupture of the Canadian federation, but that if the vilification of Quebec did not cease, the secession of that province would be inevitable.

The working of the Military Service Act in the province of Quebec was by no means smooth, and indeed, during the first few months the law was obstructed in all manner of different ways by the French Canadians. The local tribunals, which were empowered to deal with claims for exemptions, gave these exemptions *en masse*; and by the middle of February no fewer than 35,000 exemptions had been given in the province of Quebec alone. The military authorities were therefore compelled to appeal against thousands of exemptions of French Canadians. At the end of March, owing to the attempts of the military authorities to enforce the law against defaulters, very serious riots broke out in Quebec City. On April 1, troops under the command of General Lessard took over the control of Quebec City. At first, however, this did not overawe the rebellious populace, who fired on the soldiers with revolvers and

even rifles. On the side of the troops a machine-gun came into action in one locality. There were numerous casualties, particularly among the civilians, several of whom were killed. After a few days, however, the city became quieter, and in the summer it was reported that the young men of Quebec were enlisting much more willingly. The coroner's jury, which dealt with the case of the civilians who were killed in the riots, threw no blame upon the soldiers, but said that the federal police in enforcing the Military Service Act against defaulters had acted in a tactless and grossly unwise manner.

The new Parliament was opened on March 18 by the Governor-General, the Duke of Devonshire. Owing to the war there was an absence of the usual ceremony. The Speech from the Throne referred to the passing of the Conscription Act, and stated that the necessary reinforcements for the Canadian Expeditionary Force would be provided. The Governor-General announced that several Bills were in contemplation, of which the most important were a Woman Suffrage Bill, a Daylight Saving Bill, a Bill to inaugurate the reform of the Civil Service, and another financial measure embodying the principle of the taxation of war-profits.

In the debate on the following day Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the leader of the Opposition, made a vigorous speech. The Liberal leader attacked the Government with great bitterness in regard to the War-time Election Act of the previous year. He contended that by giving a vote to one section of women only, that section which the Government knew full well would support them almost unanimously, the Ministry had deliberately gerrymandered the electorate. There had, in reality, been no victory for the Government, and this deliberately dishonest Act was a sad blow to democracy. Sir Wilfrid said that he had lent his support to all the measures designed for the prosecution of the war except conscription, which, he averred, had been unnecessary and was not a success.

Sir R. Borden replied at length to the Liberal leader's criticisms, and dealt with the war situation. He said that notwithstanding the defection of Russia, he was still confident of an Allied victory, since the intervention of the United States would more than compensate for the loss of the Russian Army.

At the beginning of April a motion was introduced in the House of Commons condemning the granting of any further hereditary titles to Canadians. There was a strong feeling on this point in the country, and the principle of hereditary titles was condemned alike by Sir R. Borden and by Sir W. Laurier. During the debate the Prime Minister announced that he had made certain recommendations to the British Government on this matter. In particular, the Premier stated that he had asked the British Government not to confer titular distinctions, hereditary or otherwise, upon Canadians, except with the approval of the Canadian Prime Minister. The Canadian

Premier had also asked that no hereditary titles whatsoever should be conferred upon Canadians in the future.

The Budget was introduced in the House of Commons on April 30 by Mr. MacLean, who was acting as deputy for the Minister of Finance, Sir W. T. White, the latter statesman being indisposed. Mr. MacLean explained that the revenue for the year ending on March 31 had been 51,600,000*l.*, which was an increase of 5,200,000*l.* on the revenue for the previous year. The civil expenditure of the federation had been only 34,600,000*l.*, this sum including the payment of interest on the National Debt and also the payment of pensions, which amounted to no less than 1,400,000*l.* The capital expenditure, other than war expenditure, had amounted to 6,000,000*l.*, so that the total expenditure of the State, apart from the cost of the war, had been 40,600,000*l.* Thus, about 11,000,000*l.* remained as a balance to be applied to the war expenses. Mr. MacLean went on to explain that the war expenditure for the previous financial year had amounted to 69,000,000*l.*, and that the total war expenditure of the Dominion, up to the end of the last financial year, had amounted to about 175,000,000*l.* It was further stated that the Canadian Debt had reached the sum of about 240,000,000*l.* up to date. Mr. MacLean stated that in the Budget for the succeeding year the civil expenditure would amount to 46,000,000*l.*, and that, if the war were to continue throughout the twelve months, the expenditure upon the war, apart from the eventual liabilities incurred through advances made by Great Britain, would amount to about 85,000,000*l.* Increased taxation would be imposed, notably by an increase in the supertax on large incomes (which would reach 50 per cent. on incomes of over 200,000*l.*), and by a lowering of the exemption limit for Income Tax. The duties on tobacco and on various luxuries would also be raised. It was hoped in this manner to raise the revenue to 54,000,000*l.*

The session of Parliament was short, and early in the summer Sir Robert Borden departed for London to take part in the Imperial War Conference.

Another Canadian War Loan was issued in the autumn, and the total subscriptions were stated to have amounted to 135,200,000*l.*

Apart from the prosecution of the war the most interesting question before the country was that of Woman's Suffrage. The Woman-Franchise Bill was passed by Parliament, and the federal vote was thus conferred upon women generally. The qualifying age for the vote was to be twenty-one, an amendment moved by the Opposition leader in the Senate, raising the age to thirty, being defeated by a large majority.

At the end of the year various data were published relating to the part played by Canada in the war. It was stated that nearly 600,000 men had enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and that when the armistice was concluded 418,980 Canadian soldiers had been sent overseas.

NEWFOUNDLAND.

During the last year of the war the people of this small Dominion were more seriously affected by the conflict than they had been in previous years. The Newfoundland Regiment had greatly distinguished itself both in Gallipoli and in France, but towards the end of 1917 it became apparent that not many more recruits for the little force could be obtained by the system of voluntary enlistment. The Government, of which Mr. W. Lloyd was Premier, therefore decided to introduce a Bill to establish a system of compulsory military service. The measure of conscription which was introduced was of a limited character. The Bill provided for the enforcement of selective conscription, and rendered all unmarried men, and widowers without children, between the ages of 19 and 39, liable for military service. The conscripts were to be divided into four classes according to age, the youngest class to be called up first, of course. The Legislature was opened on April 23, and the Governor, Sir Charles Harris, announced that this Conscription Bill would be introduced. The Bill was thereupon introduced and read a first time. Before the second reading, a joint secret session of the two Houses of Parliament was held, whereat the Government made a confidential statement on the military situation. After the secret session, the House of Assembly passed the second reading of the Conscription Bill without a division, and within a few days the Bill became law. During the spring session of the Legislature a Bill was also passed, prolonging the life of Parliament, which was otherwise due to expire in 1918. In July it was announced that the practical working of the new conscription law had been thoroughly successful, and that the number of defaulters was extremely small.

MEXICO.

During the year 1918 the state of affairs in Mexico was less unsatisfactory than in recent years. It will be remembered that during the year 1917 Senor Carranza had been elected President of Mexico in a Constitutional manner, after having previously seized power in the country during the civil disturbances. Whilst Carranza had originally been merely the leader of one of the armed factions in the republic, his claims to the supreme authority were, on the whole, somewhat better than those of any of his rivals. During 1917, also, a new Congress duly assembled in Mexico City, and this was the first national Legislature to be convened since 1913, when the Mexican Parliament was forcibly dissolved by the usurping dictator, "General" Huerta. It was therefore legitimate to assume that the republic was returning to more stable conditions. General Carranza remained in power throughout 1918, and the improvement in political and social conditions continued. Bandits were, however, at large in the wilder parts of the country, and of these

the most important was "General" Villa, who had once been the rival of Carranza for the leadership of the so-called Constitutional Party.

Whilst the internal conditions were, therefore, becoming more satisfactory, Mexico was unfortunately suffering somewhat severely from the effects of the war. The prosperity of Mexico had for many years been very largely dependent upon its exports. And the Government itself derived a large proportion of the taxes from duties upon exports. Now owing to the dearth of shipping which arose in 1918, the Mexican exports—rubber, coffee, oil, and many other products—became very restricted; and the goods which should have been shipped abroad accumulated at the ports. This was the occasion not only of private losses to capitalists, but also placed the Government in financial difficulties. And the Government made it known that the suspension of payment of interest upon foreign debts which had become necessary and which continued up to the end of the year, was largely due to this cause. The Government stated that they hoped to be able before long to resume the payments of this interest.

A session of the Mexican Legislature was held in September. In his Presidential Address, Senor Carranza explained the aims which he and his Government had in view, and in regard to foreign policy he stated that the Mexican Government continued to observe the strictest neutrality towards all belligerents, and hoped to remain on friendly terms with all foreign Powers.

BRAZIL.

The opening of the year found Brazil, the greatest of the republics of Latin America, fully supporting the democracies of Europe, as one of the group of "Associated Powers." In May, 1917, the President, Senhor W. Braz, had severed diplomatic relations with Germany, and in the following October he had declared war upon that Empire. And throughout the rest of the war the Brazilian Republic co-operated in the closest manner with the United States of America. A Presidential Election was due in 1918, and, according to Brazilian law, Senhor Braz was not eligible for election. The elections, which were held on March 1, were not of an exciting character, as there was no competition either for the Presidency or for the Vice-Presidency. The sole candidate for the Presidency was Senhor Rodrigues Alves, and the only candidate for the Vice-Presidency was Senhor Delfim Moreria. Senhor Alves was a native of the State of San Paulo, and he was already a Senator for that State. He had previously been President of Brazil during the years 1902-6.

Congress was opened by Dr. W. Braz on May 3, and in his address the President reviewed the events of his four years in office. The President said that owing to the declaration of war

upon Germany, it had been necessary to improve the arrangements made for mobilising the Army against any eventuality. He said that notwithstanding the imperfect organisation of the military registers, over 400,000 men were liable for recruitment for the first line, and nearly 500,000 men were subject for enlistment into the second line. The President stated that the economic and internal condition of Brazil gave cause for some anxiety.

On November 15, in accordance with law, Dr. Wenceslao Braz gave over the seals of office to his successor, Senhor Alves. The new President, in accordance with custom, immediately appointed a new Cabinet. Among the new Ministers, Senhor D. Gama at the Foreign Office, Senhor A. Cavalcanti as Minister of Finance, and General C. Aguiar as Minister of War, may be especially mentioned.

At the end of the year it was announced that the Brazilian Government had duly sent a Delegation to the Peace Conference, and it was announced that the head of this Delegation would be Senator Eptacio.

An important event of the year was the visit of a British Mission to Brazil and to the other South American republics. The head of this British Mission was Sir Maurice de Bunsen. The first visit on the South American continent was paid by the Mission to the Brazilian Government. Sir Maurice arrived at Rio de Janeiro on May 8, and he was received with much ceremony by President Braz on the 10th. After a stay of fourteen days in Brazil, the Mission proceeded to Uruguay, Argentina, Chili, Peru, and other republics. The Mission returned to England at the beginning of October. Sir Maurice said that the Mission had been received everywhere with hospitality and enthusiasm. He said that the Legation in Brazil was now to be raised to the rank of an Embassy. The relations between Great Britain and Peru were extremely cordial, and a treaty had been concluded with that country, by which all disputes which were not capable of settlement by diplomatic means should be referred to arbitration. This treaty followed the lines of the arbitration agreement concluded with the United States some years previously. Sir Maurice said that similar treaties would probably be concluded with the Brazilian, Argentine, and Chilian Governments. Sir Maurice said that there were no serious international questions in South America, save that between Chili and Peru, which arose from the seizure of the provinces of Tacna and Arica by Chili in 1883. The British Mission had naturally not expressed any opinion as to the rights and wrongs of this controversy, but Sir Maurice had advised the South Americans to settle the question, if possible, by arbitration. Sir Maurice also said that the financial stake which Great Britain had in Latin America was enormous and ought to be better realised. He said that this financial stake probably amounted to 1,500,000,000/.

ARGENTINA.

Throughout the year the Argentine Government, of which Senhor H. Irigoyen remained President, maintained the strictest neutrality in the war, but Sir Maurice de Bunsen's Mission to South America was received most cordially at Buenos Aires in the summer. The elections for half the membership of the House of Representatives took place at the beginning of April. The elections showed that there was a strong current in favour of political stability flowing in the electorate. Of the quota of members to be elected, the Radicals secured two-thirds, the remaining members being Conservatives and Independents, together with a few Socialists. The position of the President and the Radical Government was naturally strengthened by these results.

Congress was opened by the Vice-President of the republic, Senhor Luna, on May 16, and that statesman read the Presidential message to the Legislature. The message stated that there had been disturbances in several provinces, which had necessitated intervention on the part of the Federal authorities. Nearly 3,000,000 head of cattle had been exported in 1917. Important reforms in the Argentine military system would be instituted by the Government. The Government had made it clear that Argentina would maintain her neutrality in the World War, and the Government saw no reason for modifying this attitude, since all the Argentine demands had been conceded. The President was not present at this function, as he had been urgently required in the southern provinces.

In view of the shortage of meat which had now arisen throughout the world, largely owing to the disastrous conditions in Russia, the reference in the Presidential message to the export of cattle had considerable interest. It was stated that the export of meat from Argentina in 1916 had amounted to over 400,000 tons, and this figure had been exceeded in 1917. Argentina had thus become the greatest meat-exporting country in the world, her exports of meat (including both beef and mutton) being more than five times as great as those of the United States, and over four times as great as those of Australia. The exports of meat of the other South American republics were very much less.

During the year the Argentine Republic was seriously afflicted with strikes, particularly by a strike of the workers on the Central Argentine Railway, which occurred early in the year. There was also a strike on the Argentine Pacific Railway. These strikes were at their worst in February, but after a temporary return to work some of the men again came out on strike in April. At the end of the year there were again serious disturbances in Buenos Aires and elsewhere, largely owing to the activities of Socialist agitators.

CHILI.

The Chilian Republic passed through a quiet year, Senor J. L. Sanfuentes remaining President. A General Election for the Legislature took place on March 3, with the result that the Liberal Party secured a small majority. This result caused the President's Ministry to resign. After an interval of some weeks, during which the old Ministers remained provisionally in office, a new Cabinet was appointed by the President. In the new Cabinet Senor D. Feliu became Minister for Foreign Affairs; Senor L. C. Solar became Minister of Finance, and Senor A. Alessandri became Minister of the Interior.

Congress was opened by the President in person on June 1. In his Address to the Legislature, Senor Sanfuentes began by congratulating the members of the new Congress on the purity with which the General Election had been fought. He declared that Chili would continue to maintain its strict neutrality in the Great War. The President said that he hoped that Chili and Peru would do their best to re-establish friendly political and economic relationships.

The reference to Peru contained in the President's message possessed considerable interest, because at the end of the year the antipathy existing in Peru against Chili owing to the seizure of Tacna and Arica tended to increase, and the relations between the two peoples became somewhat strained (see Peru).

THE MINOR REPUBLICS OF LATIN AMERICA.

The most notable event of the year in PERU was a revival of the traditional hostility against Chili. There was much legislative activity during the early part of the year, and during the first two months two extraordinary sessions of the Parliament were held. The regular session of Congress was opened, however by President Pardo on July 30. The President, in his opening address, stated that the visit of Sir Maurice de Bunsen to Peru had been very welcome, and Peruvians had been gratified by Sir Maurice's statement that Great Britain had adopted the international policy laid down by President Wilson. It was towards the end of the year that the hostility against Chili broke out anew. It will be remembered that a war had taken place between the two republics in the years 1879-80, and that victorious Chili had occupied and virtually annexed the Peruvian provinces of Arica and Tacna. The area of these two provinces was about 25,000 square miles. The Peruvians were now aroused by the principles being discussed all the world over in regard to the just settlement of territorial questions, and they claimed that the question of Arica and Tacna was comparable to that of Alsace and Lorraine. As popular feeling became heated in Peru it was natural that the people of Chili should also become roused. Anti-Peruvian riots occurred at Iquique on November 23, and the Peruvian Consul at that town appears to have

been mobbed. In December President Wilson made an offer to both Governments to mediate upon this question, and both Governments stated that they were willing to accept such mediation. The President of Chili stated that the Chilian Government were willing that a plebiscite should be held in the disputed territory, in order that the inhabitants might decide their own destiny, this conception being in accord with the terms of the Treaty of Ancona concluded between the two States in 1883. It was subsequently made clear by Mr. Lansing that the American President did not desire to offer actual adjudication upon the question, but only to mediate in the sense of urging the two South American Governments to come to an amicable agreement. In the middle of December there was a change of Cabinet in Peru, and Senor A. Garcia became Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Dr. German Arenas became Minister of the Interior.

At the beginning of the year a new Constitution was quietly and legally established in URUGUAY. The question of Constitutional Reform had been very thoroughly discussed in the previous year, and a scheme for a reformed Constitution had been drawn up. A plebiscite on the question took place in November, 1917, and the result of the voting was a large majority in favour of the new Constitution, the reform being supported by 84,000 votes against 4,000. The new Constitution included provisions for elections by secret ballot, and by proportional representation. The President was henceforth to be elected by a direct vote of the people. Full manhood suffrage, excluding illiterates, was established. There was to be a separation between the Church and State. Finally, the new Constitution provided for an increased parliamentary control over the Executive; and this was to be accomplished by the institution of a small committee of the two Houses, which should be kept in continuous existence between the sessions of the Legislature. In August there was a general strike in Uruguay, and serious disorder occurred in Monte Video.

On August 17 there was a change of Presidents in COLOMBIA, Dr. M. F. Suarez taking office in succession to Dr. V. Concha. The new President appointed Senor J. Holguin as Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Senor C. Vasquez as Minister of Finance.

At the end of the year a general treaty of obligatory arbitration, of a most comprehensive character, was concluded between BOLIVIA and Peru.

On April 22 it was announced from GUATEMALA that that republic, which had severed diplomatic relations with Germany in the previous year, occupied the same relationship to the belligerents which the American Government had adopted. On April 30 it was announced more definitely that the little country would participate with the United States in the war against the Central Powers. According to statements made by President E. Cabrera in his address to the Legislature in March, a movement

was on foot for the promotion of a closer union, judicial and otherwise, between the five little republics of Central America. The movement was being encouraged more particularly by the Governments of Salvador and Honduras.

On May 25 it was announced that COSTA RICA had declared war upon the Central Powers.

CHAPTER IX.

AUSTRALASIA.

I. AUSTRALIA.

At the beginning of the year Mr. W. M. Hughes was still at the head of the Commonwealth Government. This Ministry had been formed in February, 1917, by a coalition between that minority of the Labour Party which supported Mr. Hughes's war policy, on the one hand, and the Liberal Party, on the other hand. After their union these two groups took the name of the Nationalist Party, and the Coalition Cabinet included Senator G. F. Pearce, Sir J. Forrest, and Mr. Cook. The first plank in the platform of the Nationalist Party was the scheme of compulsory military service for overseas expeditions, but this policy was known to be unpopular in the country. Hence, when a General Election was held in May, 1917, the Government gave out that if they were returned to power they would not proceed with any scheme for conscription for foreign service, without referring the matter to the electorate by a special referendum. At the General Election of 1917, Mr. Hughes's Ministry was returned to power by a considerable majority. The question of conscription had been submitted to a poll of the people in 1916, and in December, 1917, the Government again took a referendum upon this question. The policy of conscription was again defeated, this time by a majority of 1,181,747 votes against 1,015,159 votes. The electors of New South Wales voted against the Government's policy by a majority of no less than 146,518, and even the Australian Army supported Mr. Hughes by only the narrow plurality of 91,642 votes against 89,859 votes.

The party situation at the opening of the year was very acute. In the first place, the conflict of political principles between the two parties was of the very sharpest character. The point of view of the Nationalist Party was strongly Imperialist, and Mr. Hughes was even accused by his political opponents of being chauvinist. On the other side, the Labour Party were much more extreme than, for instance, the majority of the Labour Party in Great Britain. They held to definite internationalist principles, and they issued a manifesto at the end of 1917 which abandoned the entire Entente standpoint in regard to the war, attributed the outbreak of the conflict to the maleficent activities of the capitalists of all countries, and declared

in favour of a peace on the basis of the Russian formula of "no indemnities and no annexations." Thus, the gulf between the two parties was very wide, and this sharp conflict of opinion, this absolute divergence on fundamental political principles, was not the only cause of the acute strife in Australian Parliamentary life. Mr. Hughes had given an undertaking before the referendum was held that, in the event of his policy being again defeated, he would no longer carry on the Government of Australia. When, therefore, it became clear that the verdict of the plebiscite was adverse to Mr. Hughes, the Opposition leaders immediately requested him to fulfil the pledge which he had given. Faced with this situation, however, Mr. Hughes procrastinated. The outcry on the part of the Labourists increased, and hence, on January 8, the Prime Minister tendered his resignation to the Governor-General, Sir R. Munro-Ferguson. The latter appears to have supposed that it might be practicable to form a Coalition Government between the two parties, but in view of the intense antagonism existing, there was never any serious possibility of this development. Mr. Tudor, the Leader of the Labour Party, was summoned to confer with the Governor-General, and it was stated that the Labour Leader advised the immediate dissolution of Parliament. Sir R. Munro-Ferguson did not take this course, however, but on the following day, January 9, asked Mr. Hughes to reassume office. The latter statesman agreed to continue to carry on the Government, and the members of the new Cabinet were duly sworn in on January 9. The personnel of the new Ministry was almost identical with that which had existed twenty-four hours earlier.

The fact that Mr. Hughes had been willing, notwithstanding his pledge, to reassume office after only twenty-four hours, and after a resignation which, his critics averred, was in reality only nominal, caused much bitterness in the Labour Party. On January 11 the Governor-General issued an explanation of his action. He said that since the Government had not been defeated in Parliament, and since it was desirable in the existing circumstances to avoid a dissolution of the Legislature, he had deemed it desirable, in the general interests of Australia, to ask Mr. Hughes, the leader of the Parliamentary majority, to reassume office. The Governor-General's statement failed to satisfy the Opposition, however, and the more extreme members of the Labour Party directed their criticisms not only against the Prime Minister, but also, to some extent, against the Governor-General as well. It was held that Mr. Hughes had been guilty of bad faith in consenting to carry on the Government after the defeat of conscription in the plebiscite.

In March changes were made in the personnel of the Federal Ministry, Mr. Watt becoming Finance Minister in succession to Sir J. Forrest.

The defeat of conscription caused those sections of the Australian public who were in favour of the war—and these

doubtless included those who had voted against conscription—to attempt to stimulate voluntary recruiting by every possible means. It was stated officially that 5,400 recruits were required monthly in order to reinforce the Australian divisions at the Front, and in the spring Mr. Orchard, who had taken an active interest in military matters throughout the war, was appointed Minister of Recruiting. The Governor-General called a conference of politicians, employers, Trade Unionist officials, and others, in the hope of uniting all sections of the country in an effort to obtain the desired number of volunteers. This conference met in Melbourne on April 12, but it was soon clear that the conference would divide on party lines, and that the Governor-General's attempt to induce the essentially discordant elements in the country to co-operate was quite impracticable. The anti-imperialist attitude of Mr. Tudor, the leader of the Federal Labour Party, and of Mr. Ryan, the Prime Minister of Queensland (where the Labour Party had been in power for some years), and of the Labour politicians generally, towards foreign policy, naturally influenced their attitude towards the recruiting problem. The leader of the Federal Labour Party stated that he and his colleagues could not assist in the recruiting campaign unless certain demands were conceded by the Government. He demanded that the policy of conscription for foreign service should be formally abandoned by the Government; he said that there ought to be a guarantee against economic conscription; and he also demanded that the War Precautions Act (the Australian equivalent of the British Defence of the Realm Act) should be modified in certain particulars, which, he claimed, restricted unnecessarily the freedom of speech and the freedom of the Press. Owing to these drastic demands by the Labour leader and his colleagues, the conference ended without coming to an agreement upon any very essential measures to increase the number of recruits for the Army.

Notwithstanding the failure of the unpractical conference called by the Governor-General, the number of recruits coming forward tended to increase during the spring and early summer. This increase was not caused by any events taking place in Australia, but was the direct reaction to the great German successes in March. These brought home to the Australians, as probably no verbal appeals could have done, the seriousness of the position in which the French Army was still placed, and the strength which the German Army still retained. Thus in August it was announced by Senator Pearce, the Minister of Defence, that the number of Australian soldiers sent overseas up to that date was 321,000, of whom about 70,000 had returned, most of the latter having been discharged from the service. After the conclusion of the armistice with Germany, it was further made known by the Government that the

number of Australian soldiers sent overseas during the whole war was 330,000, and that the total number of enlistments in Australia had been 417,574.

In April it was announced that the Federal Cabinet had agreed that Mr. Hughes himself and Mr. Cook (who had formerly been the leader of the Liberal Party) should be the Australian representatives at the forthcoming War Conference in London, and that Mr. Watt, the Minister of Finance, should be Acting Prime Minister during Mr. Hughes's visit to England.

On September 25 Mr. Watt introduced the Federal Budget into the House of Representatives. He stated that the revenue for the previous financial year had been 38,900,000*l.*, and that the ordinary expenditure of the Commonwealth had been 35,000,000*l.* The Finance Minister also announced that the war expenditure of Australia during the past financial year had been 66,700,000*l.* In the summer Mr. Watt introduced a motion into the House of Representatives authorising the Government to issue further Commonwealth War Loans up to the amount of 80,000,000*l.*, the Loans to bear interest at 5 per cent. and to be subject to taxation. The motion was duly passed by the House, and a War Loan was issued. The subscription lists closed in October, and it was stated that the total amount subscribed was 43,850,000*l.*

In May an important conference was held between Mr. Watt and the State Premiers on the question of the relations, more particularly the financial relations, between the States and the Commonwealth. Whilst this conference dealt primarily with financial matters, the general question of the powers of the State Legislatures came up for discussion. When Australia was federated, the component parts were left with very large powers, with greater powers than were possessed, for instance, by the provinces of the Canadian confederation, but public opinion had been recently tending more and more in favour of further centralisation. It was reported that the necessity for a restriction of the autonomous powers was generally admitted at this conference, even by the State Premiers themselves, and it was held that this important question would have to be faced immediately after the termination of the war.

During the summer the Labour Party, flushed with their victory in the referendum, were extremely active. After Mr. Tudor, the most prominent of the Labour leaders, was Mr. Ryan, the Prime Minister of Queensland—Queensland being the only State which possessed a Labour Government. In June the Annual Conference of the Labour Party of New South Wales was held, and a series of important resolutions was passed, which demonstrated clearly the attitude of the State Labour Party towards the war. One of the resolutions demanded that the Allies should immediately offer to enter into peace negotiations. At the end of June a still more important

meeting was held at Perth, namely, a General Australian Labour Conference. At this congress a further series of resolutions, on the lines of those already passed in New South Wales, was passed. The Labour Party congratulated the Russian Republic on the success of the revolution, and once more declared that the outbreak of the war was due to the iniquity of the capitalists of all countries. A programme of peace terms was drawn up, the terms in question not being very different from those of the British Labour Party. The most important resolution, however, was perhaps that in which the conference demanded that the Allies should immediately express their willingness to enter upon a peace by negotiation. The conference did not condemn the principle, already adopted, of course, by Australia, of compulsory military service for home defence; but it declared that an order by the Government for a general mobilisation must in future expressly declare that an immediate peril to Australia existed. The resolutions also contained the recommendation that the Commonwealth Legislature should possess a veto over any Government order for general mobilisation. The Labour Party conference also condemned the conception of Imperial Federation, and advocated more complete autonomy for the Australian Commonwealth.

In September there was a further practical development of the Labour politics. Many leading Labour politicians in Victoria and other parts of Australia declared that they would oppose any further recruiting unless a definite peace offer were made by the Allies to the Central Powers.

Even the victorious conclusion of the war does not seem to have diminished to any serious extent the sharpness of the Party conflict in Australia. And notwithstanding the success of the war policy, which had been supported so vigorously throughout by Mr. Hughes and by the Liberals, the Labourists continued actively to propagate their special theories. In December Mr. Ryan (who was about to depart to England) delivered an important speech in Sydney. He advocated various far-reaching domestic reforms, such as a wide system of insurance for workmen, and compensations for employees. Perhaps the most interesting of his suggestions, however, related to the question of the powers of the separate States, which has already been mentioned above. Mr. Ryan not only recommended that the powers of the Federal Parliament should be largely increased at the expense of the State Legislatures, but he also suggested that the States, or at least the greater States, should be divided, and that each of these territorial subdivisions should be granted small diets. It would appear from this speech of Mr. Ryan's that the Queensland Premier and many other Australian publicists were coming to favour the idea that the Constitution of Australia should evolve towards some such condition as existed in the Union of South Africa. It will be remembered that in South Africa the provincial diets possessed smaller powers

even than those retained by the provincial Legislatures of Canada.

Notwithstanding the defeat on several occasions of the policy of conscription, the part played by Australia in the war was very large in proportion to the size of the small Australian nation. The figures relating to the total recruitment in Australia have already been given. The reply of Australia to the call of the Empire was as great and as continuous as it had been prompt. As early as October, 1914, it will be remembered, the first Australian division left the Antipodes for Egypt. And the magnificent gallantry displayed by the Australian troops under the terribly severe test of the Gallipoli campaign will be immortal. And in the subsequent campaigns in France and in Palestine the Australians played an important part. Five Australian divisions co-operated in the great final advance in France, and it was reported that these divisions captured 23,000 prisoners, 330 guns, and a huge quantity of other booty. The small Australian fleet was also active, and it will be remembered that it was H.M.A.S. *Sydney* which compassed the destruction of the famous German cruiser, the *Emden*. Australia also raised a Flying Corp, which consisted of four Service Squadrons, and four Training Squadrons. The Commonwealth also contributed various auxiliary contingents, such as a Railway Corps, a Tunnelling Corps, and an excellent Army Medical Corps, all of which went to make the Australian Army complete within itself. The total casualties were stated to be as follows:—

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------|
| Killed and died | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 58,471 |
| Prisoners | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4,264 |
| Wounded | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 150,241 |
| | | | | | | | | | | <u>212,976</u> |

The distinctions won by Australian soldiers were very numerous. Sixty-three Australians won the V.C., 550 won the Distinguished Service Order, 1,989 won the Military Cross, and 1,413 won the Distinguished Conduct Medal, and thousands of soldiers won minor distinctions.

A General Election was held in Queensland in March, and Mr. Ryan was confirmed in office. The Government won a large majority of the seats, and were supported in the new Legislative Assembly by a majority of 48 members against 24.

A General Election was held in South Australia at the beginning of April. In this State, as in other parts of Australia, a coalition had been formed between the Labour conscriptionists and the Liberals, and the South Australian Government represented a coalition of this character. The Coalition or Nationalist Party were successful at the polls, and were returned with a majority of no less than 19 in the Legislative Assembly, and no less than 15 in the Legislative Council.

II. NEW ZEALAND.

The alignment of parties and political opinions in New Zealand at the beginning of the year was closely comparable to that which existed in Australia, although the position had been reached by quite a different road. At the beginning of the war the Labour or Socialist Party in New Zealand had been very weak and had played an altogether insignificant part in the affairs of the Dominion. The two great parties, the Reform Party and the Liberals, were both non-socialist and were both Imperialist, and in the year 1915 a coalition between the Reform Government, led by Mr. Massey, and the Liberal Opposition, led by Sir Joseph Ward, had been formed, and had carried on the government of the country to the satisfaction of most New Zealanders. Mr. Massey and Sir Joseph Ward had co-operated in a most cordial and patriotic manner. The Socialist Party had never possessed any influence comparable to that wielded by the Labour Party in Australia, but the class of opinion represented by the New Zealand Socialists and that represented by the Australian Labour Party after the schism with Mr. Hughes were almost identical. During the year 1918, however, indications were not absent that the Socialists were increasing in strength in the country. Early in the year Mr. Herdman, the Attorney-General, retired from public life, and an election therefore became necessary, of course, in his constituency, Wellington North. Although the anti-socialist vote was split in this election, the official Government candidate was elected, but it was not without significance that the Socialist candidate polled many more votes than were obtained by the Socialist Party in the previous election in that constituency. The increase of the Socialist polls in bye-elections became more marked in the second half of the year. An election was held in Wellington Central, and this seat was captured by the Labour candidate, a certain Mr. Fraser. It was stated, however, that many electors, who were nominally sympathetic to the Government, had shown extraordinary indifference to the contest and had not recorded their votes. Another bye-election took place in Taranaki, and the Government were again defeated, but on this occasion by an independent democratic candidate.

In April a special session of Parliament was held in order to consider the proposal that Mr. Massey and Sir Joseph Ward should be deputed by New Zealand to attend the Imperial War Conference and the Imperial War Cabinet in London during the summer. The session was very brief and only lasted for a few days. It was decided that the two statesmen should be sent to London, and Parliament also gave authority for the issue of a new War Loan to the amount of 20,000,000*l*. The Legislature also passed a Bill prolonging its life until December, 1919.

In New Zealand, as in other parts of the British Empire, the public were much impressed with the seriousness of the

military situation at the time of the great German advance in the spring. And in consequence the Government made yet more energetic efforts to increase the strength of the New Zealand Army, which was already very large in proportion to the small population of this Dominion. In April it was announced that a ballot would be taken for 10,000 men of Class B of Division 2 (*i.e.* married men with one child) of the men liable for military service. It was believed that since, doubtless, a certain number of volunteers from Classes C and D would also be forthcoming, this ballot would provide all the men who could be sent to Europe up to the autumn, in view of the restricted shipping facilities.

The regular session of Parliament was opened on October 24 by Lord Liverpool, the Governor-General. Lord Liverpool, in his Speech from the Throne, stated that the visit of Mr. Massey and Sir Joseph Ward to England had been most beneficial to the interests of New Zealand. Both these Ministers had now returned from England, and a few days later both the Prime Minister and Sir Joseph Ward made interesting speeches on the problem of Imperial relations. They both announced that it was probable that a formal Imperial Cabinet might soon be brought into existence, and this body would probably have regular periodical sessions in London. Sir Joseph Ward, who had always been an enthusiastic Imperialist, made a particularly interesting contribution to this debate. He said that the attitude of the British public towards Imperial affairs had fundamentally altered in recent years, and he said that he thought this change had been brought about, in the first instance, by the influence of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain when he was Secretary of State for the Colonies. Sir Joseph Ward also stated that in his opinion it was inevitable that some form of federal government for the Empire would be adopted sooner or later.

During the earlier part of the year there was much anxiety in New Zealand, not only in regard to the military situation, but also in regard to the developments of public opinion in Great Britain. The apparent opposition of the British Labour Party to the idea of annexations, and the uncertain attitude of that party on the question of the German colonies, gave rise to much uneasiness among the great majority of the New Zealand people. It was particularly feared that there might be some possibility that Germany would be permitted to recover her colonies in the Pacific. There was intense antagonism in New Zealand towards this idea, as it was felt on all hands that any such reappearance of Germany would be a peril to New Zealand.

The final victory of the Allies at the end of the year was of course greeted with great enthusiasm in the Dominion. And New Zealanders had legitimate pride in the part which their nation had played in the great conflict. The contribution of New Zealand towards the fighting forces of the Empire was larger in proportion to her population than that made by any

other of the British Overseas Dominions. Over 99,000 troops had been actually embarked to Europe and the various other fronts, and over 10,000 more soldiers were, at the time of the conclusion of the armistice, in camp in their own country. The entire cost of the New Zealand Expeditionary Force had been borne by the Dominion taxpayers, and over 40,000,000*l.* had been raised by the colonial War Loans. The proportion of casualties in the New Zealand forces had unfortunately been very high. The total number of casualties was stated to be 52,674, and the number of the killed was 14,463. Many distinctions were also won by the soldiers of the Dominion. Seven members of the New Zealand Army won the Victoria Cross, 108 won the Distinguished Service Order, 370 won the Military Cross, and 256 won the Distinguished Conduct Medal. Many minor distinctions were also won. In the minds of New Zealanders, however, as in the opinion of the rest of the world, the greatest distinction gained by the Dominion was that record of valour earned by the earlier New Zealand contingent as a whole—and which they shared with the Australians—in the disastrous but glorious Gallipoli campaign.

PART II.

CHRONICLE OF EVENTS

IN 1918.

JANUARY.

1. The New Year's Honours List included four new peers, Sir Frederick Cawley, Sir John Lonsdale, Mr. Almeric Paget, and Sir James Woodhouse. The Privy Councillorships included Lord Hugh Cecil, Sir Henry Craik, Sir Gordon Hewart the Solicitor-General, Sir Henry Norman, and others. There were twenty baronetcies, including Mr. Justice Barton, Mr. James Craig, M.P., Mr. Ellis Griffith, K.C., M.P., and the Attorney-General. Military honours included General Plumer, General Trenchard, General Haldane, General Milne, General William Lambton, and Lord Cavan.

2. Announcement that Sir Cecil Spring Rice, British Ambassador at Washington, was about to retire.

— Establishment of the Air Council with Lord Rothermere as President and Major-General Sir H. Trenchard, K.C.B., D.S.O., as Chief of the Air Staff.

— Resignation of Sir Edward Morris, Prime Minister of Newfoundland. A Barony was conferred upon him by the King.

4. *The Times* announced that Sir George Buchanan, British Ambassador at Petrograd, was returning to England.

— The election of Dr. Herbert Hensley Henson as Bishop of Hereford took place at Hereford Cathedral.

— The *Rewa*, a vessel of over 7,000 tons, fully lighted with Red Cross markings, was attacked without warning in the Bristol Channel and sunk; all the wounded on board were saved.

7. Commencement of the sale of National War Bonds for £5, called Nominative Bonds.

— Complaints of meat shortage were general throughout the country.

— Announcement that one of H.M. destroyers had been sunk in the Mediterranean with the loss of ten men.

8. The Earl of Reading, G.C.B., K.C.V.O., was appointed High Commissioner and Special Ambassador in the United States.

8. A list of nearly 1,500 names was published announcing appointments to the Order of the British Empire.

9. Lord Curzon announced the abandonment of the Government scheme to take over the British Museum for the Air Ministry. The scheme had been met with vigorous opposition from various quarters.

— H.M.S. *Raccoon* struck some rocks off the north coast of Ireland during a snowstorm and foundered with all hands.

10. Mr. Arthur Francis Pease was appointed a Lord Commissioner of the Admiralty with the title of Second Civil Lord.

12. Vice-Admiral Sir Reginald H. S. Bacon, K.C.B., K.C.V.O., D.S.O., was appointed Controller of the Munitions Inventions Department in succession to Colonel H. E. F. Goold-Adams, C.B., C.M.G.

— Two of H.M. destroyers ran ashore off the coast of Scotland and became total wrecks with the loss of all hands except one.

14. It was officially announced that the War Cabinet had decided to increase the pay of junior officers in the Navy and Army, adopting the principle of a minimum rate for an Army Officer of 10s. 6d. a day.

— It was announced that from March 1, Colonel T. H. J. C. Goodwin, C.M.G., D.S.O., would succeed Surgeon-General Sir Alfred Keogh, G.C.B., as Director-General of Army medical services.

— Yarmouth was bombarded from the sea, six persons being killed and seven injured.

17. Commodore Sir Reginald Y. Tyrwhitt, K.C.B., D.S.O., A.D.C., was appointed Acting Rear-Admiral.

20. In a battle at the entrance to the Dardanelles the *Breslau* was sunk and the *Goeben* badly damaged by British forces.

— H.M.S. *Mechanician* armed escort vessel was torpedoed and subsequently stranded in the English Channel. Three officers and ten men were lost.

21. Complaints continued as to the difficulty of procuring meat and margarine.

— Sir Edward Carson resigned his position as a member of the War Cabinet.

— H.M. armed boarding steamer *Louvain* was torpedoed and sunk by a German submarine in the Eastern Mediterranean with the loss of seven officers and 217 men.

24. Lord Rhondda expressed the view that compulsory rationing was inevitable and urgent.

25. Two meatless days a week came into force at hotels, restaurants, and clubs.

27. The Cunard Liner *Andania* was torpedoed off the Ulster coast but no lives were lost.

28. Hostile aeroplanes crossed the Kent and Essex coast and dropped bombs on London, one enemy machine being brought down in Essex. The casualties were forty-seven killed and 169 injured.

28. H.M.S. *Hazard* torpedo-gunboat was sunk in the English Channel as the result of a collision and three men lost.

30. The Right Honourable Sir Henry Norman, Bart., M.P., was appointed an additional member of the Air Council.

31. Sir Laming Worthington Evans, Bart., M.P., was appointed Financial Secretary to the Ministry of Munitions with the title of Parliamentary and Financial Secretary.

FEBRUARY.

1. At a bye-election in the Prestwich division of Lancashire, Lieutenant Cawley (Government candidate) was elected by a majority of 5,688 over Mr. H. J. May (co-operators).

— *The Times* announced that an agreement had been made for the amalgamation of the London County and Westminster Bank and Parr's Bank, under the title of the "London County Westminster and Parr's Bank, Ltd."

5. The Anchor liner *Tuscania* was torpedoed off the Irish Coast while carrying United States troops, 166 men being lost.

8. The King conferred a barony on the Right Honourable Sir John Forrest, P.C., G.C.M.G., Treasurer of the Commonwealth of Australia.

— H.M. destroyer *Boxer* was sunk in the Channel as the result of a collision, one boy being lost.

9. Sir Joseph John Thomson, O.M., D.C.S., F.R.S., was appointed Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.

— Peace was signed at 2 A.M. between Germany, Austria, and the Ukraine.

10. The President of the Russian delegation at Brest-Litovsk stated that Russia, while not signing a formal peace treaty, declared the state of war ended with Germany, Austria, Turkey, and Bulgaria, and was giving orders for the complete demobilisation of the Russian forces on all fronts.

11. *The Times* announced that Lord Beaverbrook had been appointed Minister in Charge of Propaganda in succession to Sir Edward Carson, with the office of Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, vacated by Lord Cawley of Prestwich.

12. Opening of the new Session of Parliament.

13. Sir James Meston was appointed Financial Member of the Governor's Council in India in succession to Sir William Meyer.

14. Bolo Pasha and his Italian associate Cavallini were condemned to death by Court Martial in Paris for high treason.

16. General Sir William Robertson resigned his position as Chief of the Imperial Staff and was succeeded by General Sir Henry Wilson.

— Dover was attacked by an enemy submarine; one child was killed and seven persons injured.

16. Hostile aeroplanes attempted to attack London but only succeeded in dropping one bomb in the capital ; eleven persons were killed and four injured.

17. Hostile aeroplanes dropped bombs over London, killing nineteen persons and injuring thirty-four.

18. Lord Northcliffe was appointed Director of Propaganda in enemy countries.

— Senator Charles Humbert, ex-proprietor of the *Paris Journal*, was arrested.

19. The Prince of Wales took his seat in the House of Lords as a Peer of the Realm.

— The Amalgamated Society of Engineers decided by a majority of 93,547 not to accept the proposals of the Government for combing out young men from protected war industries.

20. Lieut.-General Sir Bryan Mahon, Commander-in-Chief of the forces in Ireland, made an order prohibiting the carrying of fire-arms in Ireland.

— Opening of an Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference in London.

21. Lieut.-Colonel C. Repington, military correspondent, and Mr. H. A. Gwynne, editor of the *Morning Post*, were fined £100 each for contravening the Defence of the Realm regulations in publishing information without lawful authority, with regard to disposition of military forces and supposed plans of military operations.

22. Mr. W. A. Robinson, C.B., C.B.E., was appointed Permanent Secretary to the Air Council in the Air Ministry.

23. Close of the Inter-Allied Labour and Socialist Conference.

24. The Russians accepted Peace conditions offered by the German Government.

— The steamer *Florizel* went ashore at Cape Race, with the loss of 102 lives.

25. The rationing of meat, butter, and margarine came into force in London and the Home Counties ; the ration was fixed at $\frac{1}{4}$ lb. butter or margarine each person per week, and 1s. 3d. worth of uncooked butcher's meat, and about 5 oz. of other meat for each person per week.

26. H.M. hospital ship *Glenart Castle* was sunk in the Bristol Channel.

MARCH.

1. The armed mercantile cruiser *Calgarian*, formerly one of the largest vessels of the Allan Line, was torpedoed and sunk by a German submarine off the North Coast of Ireland, with the loss of two officers and forty-six men.

4. At the Central Criminal Court a woman named Louise Smith was sentenced to ten years' penal servitude as a spy.

— A "Business Men's Week" campaign began for the sale of National War Bonds. On the opening day the amount subscribed through the tanks and the banks in London was 11,166,837l.

5. An explosion occurred at a small shop at a Government works to the south of London, in which four men were killed, and one was seriously injured.

6. *The Times* announced that Lord Colwyn would act as chairman of a committee which had been appointed to inquire into the question of Bank amalgamations.

7. Hostile aeroplanes crossed the East Coast, two of them reaching London. Eleven persons were killed and forty-six injured.

8. Lord Derby was appointed Chairman of the National Salvage Council, whose functions were to assist in the prevention of waste, and arrange for the re-utilisation of waste products.

9. End of "Business Men's Week"; the amount raised in London during the week by the sale of National War Bonds and War Savings Certificates was 75,069,188*l*.

10. The *Guildford Castle*, a Red Cross ship, was attacked by a German submarine at the entrance to the Bristol Channel, but was able to make port.

11. Price of *The Times* raised from 2*d*. to 3*d*. ; the previous increase to 2*d*. took place on February 20, 1917.

— Hostile aeroplanes raided Paris.

12. Mr. E. H. Cautley, M.P., was appointed Director of Pig Production.

— At a meeting of the Nationalist Party in Dublin, Mr. John Dillon was unanimously elected Chairman of the party in place of Mr. John Redmond.

— The Yorkshire coast was attacked by hostile airships, which, however, caused little damage.

15. A large explosion occurred near Paris in the Courneuve district, from which thirty deaths resulted, and nearly 1,500 persons were injured.

18. *The Times* announced the impending appointment of Lord Pirrie as Director of Shipbuilding.

20. The President of the Board of Trade announced new regulations, under which no food was to be cooked or hot meals served in any hotel or restaurant after 9.30 at night. All performances in theatres were to be finished by 10.30 P.M.

21. A destroyer action took place off Dunkirk, in which two enemy destroyers and two enemy torpedo-boats were believed to have been sunk.

22. One of H.M.'s mine-sweeping sloops struck a mine and sank, two officers and sixty-four men being lost.

23. Sir Sam Fay was appointed Director-General of Movements and Railways in succession to Sir Guy Granet, who had undertaken to visit the United States in connexion with food and transportation problems.

— The Germans shelled Paris with a long-range gun from a distance of about 75 miles.

23. One of H.M. destroyers sank after a collision, with the loss of one officer and one man.

24. Summer-time came into force at 2 A.M., clocks and watches being put forward one hour.

25. An Inter-Allied Conference on food supplies was opened in Paris, with Mr. Crosby as Chairman.

27. Conclusion of the Inter-Allied Conference in Paris.

— One of H.M. destroyers struck a mine and sank, with the loss of one officer and forty men.

28. The King left London to visit the troops on the Western Front.

30. The King awarded the V.C. to 2nd Lieutenant James Byford McCudden, D.S.O., M.C., M.M., Royal Flying Corps, for conspicuous bravery and devotion to duty.

— The King returned to London from the Western Front.

APRIL.

2. Sir William Gallagher, I.S.O., was appointed a Commissioner of Customs and Excise in succession to Sir Arthur J. Tedder who had resigned.

4. At a bye-election in East Tyrone, Mr. T. J. S. Harrison (Nationalist) was returned by a majority of 580 over Mr. J. McIlroy (Sinn Fein).

— A Royal Warrant was issued, providing that promotions to the rank of General should be by selection and not by seniority.

— One of H.M. destroyers sank as the result of a collision, and all hands were drowned.

5. The fifty-first and final meeting of the Irish Convention was held at Trinity College, Dublin.

8. The Right Hon. James O'Connor, K.C., Attorney-General for Ireland, was appointed a Judge of the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice in Ireland in place of Sir Dunbar Plunket Barton, Bart., who had retired.

9. The Prime Minister introduced the new Military Service Bill into the House of Commons by which the age-limit was raised to 50.

11. Announcement that Major-General the Hon. C. J. Sackville-West had been appointed Acting British Military Representative on the Supreme War Council at Versailles in place of General Sir Henry Rawlinson, who had been appointed to command the 5th Army.

12. Hostile airships crossed the East Coast and attacked certain Eastern and Midland districts. Five people were killed and fifteen injured.

13. *The Times* published an account of the Report of the Irish Convention.

14. Retirement of General Sarrail.

14. Official announcement that the British and French Governments had agreed to confer upon General Foch the title of Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Armies in France.

15. Major-General F. H. Sykes, C.M.G., was appointed Chief of the Air Staff, Royal Air Force, on the resignation of Major-General Sir Hugh Trenchard, K.C.B., D.S.O.

— Brigadier-General Arthur N. Asquith, D.S.O., was appointed Controller of the Trench Warfare Department of the Ministry of Munitions.

— Resignation of Count Czernin from the Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

— The Grand Fleet undertook a sweep of the Cattegat and sank ten German trawlers.

17. *The Times* Fund of the Joint War Committee of the British Red Cross Society and the Order of St. John reached a total of 10,000,000*l.*, and a letter of congratulation was addressed to *The Times* by the King.

— Execution of Bolo Pasha.

— Lieut.-General Gillain was appointed Chief of the Staff of the Belgian Army in succession to Lieut.-General Rucquoy who had resigned.

— Baron Vurain, the Austro-Hungarian Finance Minister, was appointed Joint Minister for Foreign Affairs in place of Count Czernin.

18. Resignation of Lieut.-General Sir David Henderson, K.C.B., D.S.O., from his office of Vice-President of the Air Council.

— The New Military Service Bill passed into law.

19. *The Times* announced that the Earl of Derby had been appointed Ambassador Extraordinary to France, that Viscount Milner had been appointed Secretary of State for War in place of Lord Derby, and that the Right Hon. Austen Chamberlain, M.P., had been made a member of the War Cabinet.

20. A Proclamation was issued under the new Military Service Act withdrawing exemption certificates for men below the age of 23½ years with certain exceptions.

22. Two old British cruisers laden with concrete were sunk in the entrance to the Bruges Canal at Zeebrugge in order to block it; two other block ships were run ashore and blown up at Ostend for the same purpose.

25. Resignation of Lord Rothermere as Secretary of State of the Air Force.

— H.M. sloop *Cowslip* was torpedoed and sunk, with the loss of five officers and one man.

— H.M. torpedo-boat No. 90 foundered during heavy weather, with the loss of one officer and twelve men.

26. Sir William Weir was appointed Secretary of State for the Air Force in succession to Lord Rothermere.

27. Opening of the War Conference at Delhi.

29. Mr. Ian Macpherson, M.P., Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for War, was appointed Vice-President of the Army Council and to act as Deputy Secretary of State.

— Major-General C. H. Harington, C.B., D.S.O., was appointed Deputy Chief of the Imperial General Staff in place of Major-General Sir R. D. Whigham, K.C.B., D.S.O., who had taken up an appointment with the British Expeditionary Force in France.

MAY.

1. *The Times* announced the appointment of the Right Hon. Sir Charles Swinfen Eady as Master of the Rolls in place of the Right Hon. Lord Cozens-Hardy (resigned). The Right Hon. H. E. Duke, K.C., M.P., was appointed a Lord Justice of the Court of Appeal in place of Lord Justice Sir Charles Swinfen Eady.

— One of H.M. minesweepers struck a mine and sank, with the loss of three officers and twenty-three men.

3. The Prime Minister and Lord Milner returned from France where they had been attending meetings of the Fifth Session of the Supreme War Council.

— The Bank of England appointed Sir Gordon Nairne, Comptroller of the Bank to date from May 9.

6. Field-Marshal Viscount French, O.M., K.P., was appointed Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland in place of Lord Wimborne (resigned).

— Mr. Edward Shortt, K.C., M.P., was appointed Chief Secretary for Ireland in place of the Right Hon. H. E. Duke, K.C., M.P., who had been appointed a Lord Justice of Appeal.

— One of H.M. minesweeping sloops was torpedoed by a German submarine and sunk, with the loss of two officers and thirteen men.

7. Nicaragua declared war on Germany and her Allies.

— Sir Arthur Duckham, K.C.B., was appointed to superintend as member of Munitions Council the duties of Aircraft production in succession to Sir William Weir.

8. Announcement that from May 21 passengers from Great Britain to Ireland would require a passport.

9. The operation of closing the ports of Ostend and Zeebrugge was successfully completed by the sinking of the obsolete cruiser H.M.S. *Vindictive* between the piers and across the entrance of Ostend harbour.

10. A Royal Warrant was issued authorising as a temporary measure the formation of a machine-gun regiment of Foot Guards, to be known as the Guards Machine-Gun Regiment.

12. The value of the meat coupon was raised from 5d. worth to 6d. worth of butcher's meat.

— Meeting between the German and Austrian Emperors at German Main Headquarters.

14. One of H.M. destroyers was torpedoed and sunk by an enemy submarine, with a loss of two men.

15. Duval, one of the managers of the *Bonnet Rouge* newspaper, was condemned to death by a Court Martial in Paris on the charge of having received forty thousand pounds of German money for carrying on a defeatist campaign in his newspaper.

17. Abolition of compulsory meatless days in eating places in Great Britain.

— *The Times* announced that Dr. Warre, Provost of Eton, was about to resign office on account of old age and illness.

— Lord French, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, issued a Proclamation declaring the existence of a Pro-German conspiracy in that country; a large number of Sinn Fein leaders were forthwith arrested.

18. The King conferred a Viscounty of the United Kingdom on the Right Hon. Baron Wimborne.

— The King appointed the Hon. William Frederick Lloyd, K.C., D.C.L., Prime Minister of Newfoundland, to be a member of the Privy Council.

— A posthumous award of the V.C. was made to seaman J. H. Carless, for conspicuous bravery in the action in the Heligoland Bight in November, 1917.

— British airmen dropped thirty-three bombs in Cologne in daylight.

19. Hostile aircraft crossed the coast of Kent and Essex, and dropped bombs on London, thirty-seven persons being killed and 161 injured. Four of the raiders were brought down.

22. Lord Hylton was appointed Captain of His Majesty's bodyguard of the Yeomen of the Guard, in place of Colonel Lord Suffield, C.B., M.V.O., resigned.

— Completion of the Katanga railway, whereby communication by rail was established from Cape Town to Bukama on the Upper Congo.

23. H.M. armed mercantile cruiser *Moldavia* was torpedoed and sunk, with a loss of fifty-six American troops.

24. *The Times* announced the decision of the War Cabinet that racing in England after May 31 was to be limited to Newmarket.

— The King and Queen were present at a celebration of Empire Day in the Albert Hall. Greetings were sent from the Allies to Great Britain.

25. Sir Napier Shaw, F.R.S., was appointed for the period of the War Scientific Adviser to His Majesty's Government in meteorology.

26. H.M. transport *Leasowe Castle* was torpedoed and sunk by an enemy submarine in the Mediterranean, with a loss of thirteen military officers, seventy-nine other ranks, and nine of the ship's company.

27. The Army Council appointed Major-General C. H. Burtchaell, C.B., C.M.G., as Director-General of Medical Services, British Armies in France, in succession to Lieut.-General Sir A. T. Sloggett, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., K.C.V.O.

— British aeroplanes bombed the port of Durazzo in Albania, and sank an Austrian torpedo-boat.

28. The Germans captured Soissons.

29. A Commercial and Navigation Agreement was signed in London between Sweden and Great Britain and Allies.

31. The United States transport *President Lincoln*, of over 18,000 tons, was torpedoed and sunk on her return voyage to the United States.

— One of H.M. destroyers was sunk after a collision, with no casualties.

JUNE.

3. The new postage rates came into force whereby the ordinary letter rate was raised to 1½d.

— The King's birthday honours included three new peers—Sir Matthew Arthur of Troon, Sir William Tatem, the Cardiff shipowner, and Mr. G. D. Faber, M.P., for Clapham. Lord St. Davids and Lord Rhondda, the Food Controller, became Viscounts. Seven new Privy Councillors included Mr. W. Adamson, M.P., Chairman of the Parliamentary Labour Party, and Mr. J. I. Macpherson, M.P., Deputy Secretary for War; fourteen baronets included Mr. J. G. Butcher, K.C., M.P., Mr. Guy Calthrop, the Coal Controller, and Mr. Lester Harmsworth, M.P.; fifty-two Knighthoods were conferred and two new decorations instituted to be awarded to officers and warrant officers in the Royal Air Force, and two new medals for non-commissioned officers and men in the Royal Air Force.

4. Mr. N. Pemberton Billing, M.P., was acquitted at the Central Criminal Court on a charge of publishing a false and defamatory libel on Miss Maud Allan [*v. Eng. Hist.*, p. [105].

— M. Cooreman became Belgian Prime Minister, in place of Baron de Vroqueville resigned.

— The Prime Minister and other members of the Cabinet returned to London from France where they had been attending the Sixth Session of the Supreme War Council.

5. The Right Hon. Sir James H. Campbell, Bart., K.C., was appointed Lord Chancellor of Ireland, in succession to the Right Hon. Sir Ignatius O'Brien, Bart., K.C., resigned. A peerage was conferred upon Sir Ignatius O'Brien.

— General Sir W. R. Robertson was appointed to command the forces in Great Britain as from May 30.

— One of H.M. armed boarding steamers was torpedoed and sunk by a German submarine, with a loss of seven men.

8. Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister of Canada, and Mr. W. F. Massey, Prime Minister of New Zealand, arrived in London to attend meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet.

— Discovery of a new star of the first magnitude.

— The King appointed Lieut.-General Sir Launcelot Edward Kiggell, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., to be Lieut.-Governor of Guernsey in place of General Sir Reginald Hart, V.C., K.C.B., K.C.V.O., resigned.

11. First meeting of the Imperial War Cabinet at 10 Downing Street.

— Lieut.-Colonel R. A. Sanders, M.P., was appointed Treasurer of the Household in succession to Sir James Craig, M.P., resigned.

12. The Maharajah of Patiala and Sir S. P. Sinha arrived in London to represent India at the Imperial War Cabinet.

— Admission in Vienna that the battleship *Szent Istvan* was lost as the result of a torpedo attack in the Adriatic. Several officers and eighty of the crew were missing.

13. H.M. armed mercantile cruiser *Patia* was torpedoed and sunk by a German submarine, with the loss of one officer and fifteen men.

14. General Guillaumat was appointed Military Governor of Paris, in succession to General Dubail who had been appointed Grand Chancellor of the Legion of Honour.

15. Mr. W. M. Hughes, Prime Minister of the Australian Commonwealth, and Mr. Joseph Cook, Minister for the Australian Navy, arrived in London.

17. The second meeting of the Imperial War Conference was held at the Colonial Office.

19. The King conferred a peerage on the Right Hon. Sir William Weir, Secretary of State for the Air Force.

20. Major-General Edward Northey, C.B., was appointed Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the East Africa Protectorate, and High Commissioner for the Zanzibar Protectorate.

21. A Parliamentary Supper was held in the Royal Gallery of the House of Lords, to welcome the Dominion Prime Ministers and Ministers attending the Imperial War Cabinet.

— At a bye-election in the Clapham division Mr. Harry Greer (Government) was returned by a majority of 1,181 over Mr. H. H. Beamish (Independent). In East Cavan, Mr. Griffith (Sinn Fein) defeated Mr. O'Hallon (Nationalist) by a majority of 1,214.

25. General Sir Horace Smith-Dorrien, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., D.S.O., was appointed Governor of Gibraltar.

26. Opening of the Labour Party Conference in London. M. Kerensky appeared at the meeting.

27. H.M. hospital ship *Llandoverly Castle* was torpedoed by an enemy submarine about 116 miles south-west of the Fastnet, about 230 persons being lost.

29. *The Times* announced the impending resignation of Dr. Jayne, Bishop of Chester.

JULY.

1. The King conferred a peerage on Colonel Sir Arthur Hamilton Lee, K.C.B., M.P., on account of his public services as Director-General of Food Production, 1917-18.

— The Rev. Prebendary William S. Swayne was appointed Dean of Manchester.

1. A new household fuel and lighting order came into force, the object of which was to save not less than a quarter of the coal hitherto available for domestic use.

— An explosion occurred at a national shell-filling factory in the Midlands, whereby approximately 100 lives were lost, and 150 persons injured.

2. Captain H. R. Crooke was appointed Director of Naval Ordnance, and Captain F. C. Dreyer, C.B., Director of Naval Artillery and Torpedoes, Naval Staff.

— Opening of the Inter-parliamentary Commercial Conference in London.

3. Death of Lord Rhondda, the Food Controller (*v. Obit.*).

— Death of the Sultan of Turkey (*v. Obit.*).

4. Celebration of American Independence Day in all the Allied Countries.

6. Assassination of Count Mirbach, German Ambassador in Russia, by means of a bomb.

8. *The Times* fund on behalf of the British Red Cross Society and the Order of St. John reached 11,000,000*l.*

10. The Right Hon. John Robert Clynes, M.P., was appointed Food Controller in succession to the late Lord Rhondda.

— The German Emperor accepted the resignation of Herr von Kühlmann, Foreign Secretary.

11. The United States supply ship *Westover* was sunk by torpedo in European waters, ten men being lost.

12. *The Times* announced that a provisional agreement had been entered into for an amalgamation between Barclay's Bank and the London Provincial and South-Western Bank as from December 31 last under the name of Barclay's Bank, Ltd.

— The consent of the Treasury was given to the amalgamation of the London Joint Stock Bank with the London City and Midland Bank.

— General Cadorna, formerly Commander-in-Chief of the Italian Armies, was placed on the retired list with loss of rank and pay; this was due to the defeat of the 2nd Army on the Isonzo in the Autumn of 1917.

— The Japanese battleship *Kawachi* blew up in Tokuyama Bay and sank with the loss of over 500 lives.

14. The Messageries Maritimes steamer *Djemnah* was torpedoed by a submarine, with the loss of 442 lives, in the Mediterranean.

15. Major C. W. Brins, M.C., R.F.A., was appointed Director of Extensions in the department of the Controller-General of Merchant Shipping.

— H.M. transport *Barunga* was torpedoed and sunk by a German submarine without casualties.

16. At a bye-election in the East Finsbury division the Government candidate, Mr. H. E. A. Cotton, was elected by a majority of 580 over the first of the two Independent candidates who stood against him.

16. The ex-Tsar of Russia, Nicholas Romanoff, was shot by order of the Presidium of the Ural Regional Council.

17. Execution at Vincennes of Duval who had been condemned to death on May 15.

18. The King conferred the G.C.B. on General John Pershing, Commander-in-Chief of the United States Expeditionary Force in France.

— Commencement of a great counter-attack by the French on the Germans in France.

19. Sir L. Worthington Evans, Bart., M.P., was appointed Minister of Blockade in succession to the Right Hon. Lord Robert Cecil, K.C., M.P., who was appointed Assistant Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

— Major-General the Right Hon. J. E. B. Seely, C.B., D.S.O., M.P., was appointed Parliamentary Under-Secretary to the Minister of Munitions in succession to Sir L. Worthington Evans.

— Major the Hon. Waldorf Astor, M.P., was appointed Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food in succession to the Right Hon. J. R. Clynes, M.P.

20. The *Justicia*, a White Star liner of 32,000 tons, was torpedoed and sunk off the North Coast of Ireland after a long fight with German submarines. One of the submarines was sunk by H.M.S. *Marne*.

22. Lord Lee of Fareham resigned his position as Director-General of Food Production.

23. Twelve thousand munition workers stopped work at Coventry owing to a Government embargo on the employment of additional skilled labour.

— A meeting of the Allied Food Controllers took place in London.

— H.M. armed mercantile cruiser *Marmora* was torpedoed and sunk by a German submarine, with a loss of ten of her crew.

24. Dr. Helfferich was appointed to succeed Count Mirbach as German Ambassador at Moscow.

— One of H.M. torpedo-boat destroyers ran ashore and sank, with the loss of thirteen of her crew.

25. A conference of the National Engineering and Allied Trades Council at Leeds decided in favour of a general strike to begin on July 30.

29. End of the munition strike at Coventry and Birmingham.

30. Major-General John Biddle, commanding American troops in the United Kingdom, was appointed an honorary K.C.B.

31. Sir Charles W. Fielding, K.B.E., was appointed Director-General of Food Production in succession to Lord Lee of Fareham.

— Dr. Montagu Rhodes James accepted the appointment of Provost of Eton as from next Michaelmas day.

— Marshal von Eichhorn, the German military dictator in the Ukraine, was assassinated by social revolutionists with a bomb at Kieff.

AUGUST.

2. The Right Hon. Thomas Francis Molony, K.C., was appointed Lord Chief Justice in Ireland. The Right Hon. James O'Connor, K.C., was appointed a Judge of the Irish Court of Appeal.

— The French captured Soissons.

— Two of H.M. torpedo-boat destroyers were sunk by enemy mines, with a loss of five officers and ninety-two ratings.

— Allied forces, naval and military, landed at Archangel.

3. Homeward-bound ambulance transport *Warilda* was torpedoed and sunk, with the loss of 116 drowned.

5. Five enemy airships attempted to cross the coast but were attacked by Royal Air Force contingents; one was damaged and another shot down in flames 40 miles from the coast.

6. The King conferred a Viscounty on the Right Hon. Lord Bertie of Thame, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O., in recognition of his services as Ambassador in Paris.

— One of H.M. destroyers was torpedoed and sunk by enemy submarines in the Mediterranean after being seriously damaged by a collision, in which two officers and five men lost their lives.

9. News reached the Foreign Office that Mr. Robert Lockhart, Acting British Consul-General in Moscow, had been arrested by the Bolshevik Administration.

11. British airmen bombed Karlsruhe.

— Arrival of the first Japanese contingents at Vladivostok.

12. Official announcement of the formation of the First American Army in France under the command of General Pershing.

— News arrived of the release of Mr. Lockhart by the Bolsheviks.

13. The King returned to England, after a visit of nine days to the armies in France.

— The British Government officially recognised the Czecho-Slovak people as a nation.

15. Subscriptions for National War Bonds reached 1,000,000,000/.

— The United States severed relations with the Bolshevik Government of Russia.

— Two of H.M. destroyers struck mines and sank, twenty-six men being lost.

16. Anniversary of the landing of the British Expeditionary Force in France.

— Lord Northcliffe entertained representatives of the Overseas press visiting England at Printing House Square.

— Sir Charles Eliot, Principal of Hong Kong University, was appointed British High Commissioner in Siberia with diplomatic rank.

20. Sir Guy Calthrop, the Coal Controller, stated that the coal deficiency amounted to about 36,000,000 tons a year,

20. A Belgian relief ship was sunk by a German submarine off Utsire, six of the crew being killed.

21-22. The Independent Air Force bombed Frankfort, Cologne, Mannheim, and Trèves.

22. *The Times* announced that the price of barley was to be 67s. per quarter for this season's crop, and the price of oats was to begin at 47s. 6d.

23. Mr. Hoover, the United States Food Controller, arrived in America on his return from his mission in Europe.

24. Major-General Sir Godfrey Paine, K.C.B., M.V.O., was appointed Inspector-General of the Royal Air Force, Major-General W. S. Brancker became Master-General of Personnel, and Major-General E. L. Ellington, C.M.G., Controller-General of Equipment.

27. Major-General Geoffrey C. T. Fielding, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., was appointed to succeed Lieut.-General Sir Francis Lloyd, on his retirement from the London District Command on October 1.

28. *The Times* announced that Mr. Page, American Ambassador in London, was obliged to retire on account of ill-health due to overwork.

29. Capture of Noyon by the French.

— Capture of Bapaume by the British.

30. The Government appointed a committee, under the Chairmanship of the Hon. Mr. Justice Atkin, to investigate and report as to the relations that should be maintained between the wages of women and men.

— Commencement of a strike of London police.

31. A Royal Commission was appointed under the Chairmanship of Lord Emmott, G.C.M.G., G.B.E., to consider the advisability of adopting a decimal coinage.

— Sir Joseph Jonas, who had recently been convicted of misdemeanour under the Official Secrets Act, 1911, was degraded from the degree of Knight Bachelor.

— Settlement of the police strike in London.

— Bolshevik troops attacked the British Embassy at Petrograd, and killed Captain Francis Cromie, the Naval Attaché.

SEPTEMBER.

1. Capture of Péronne by the British.

2. Opening of the Trades Union Congress at Derby.

— General Sir Ian Hamilton, G.C.B., D.S.O., was appointed Lieutenant of the Tower of London.

6. Mrs. Gwynne-Vaughan, C.B.E., was appointed Commandant of the Women's Royal Air Force.

10. The Food Controller announced that the retail price of meat would be increased by approximately 2d. per lb. from September 22.

11. Major-General Sir George M. W. Macdonogh, K.C.M.G., C.B., was appointed Adjutant-General to the Forces.

11. Prince Frederick Charles of Hesse was chosen as future King of Finland.

12. The American Army started an offensive against St. Mihiel ; this was the first time that the First American Army under the command of General Pershing went into action.

— The Union Castle liner, *Galway Castle*, was torpedoed without warning, and 154 persons were reported missing.

— One of H.M. armed boarding steamers was torpedoed and sunk, with the loss of eight officers and fifty men.

13. Sir John Beale, K.B.E., was appointed Chief Secretary to the Ministry of Food in place of Mr. U. F. Wintour, C.B., C.M.G., who became Controller of the Stationery Office.

— The Austro-Hungarian Government issued an invitation to the belligerent Governments to take part in a discussion on neutral territory at which views on peace could be exchanged.

15. Mr. C. H. E. Chubb presented Stonehenge to the nation. The Treasury agreed to his suggestion that while the war lasted, the income from the property should be handed to the British Red Cross Society.

16. A strike began of the Lancashire cotton spinners.

— The President of the United States refused the Austro-Hungarian invitation to a Peace Conference.

— A British monitor was sunk in harbour as the result of an internal explosion ; one officer and nineteen men were killed by the explosion and fifty-seven men were missing, presumed killed.

17. *The Times* announced the appointment of Major-General W. Thwaites, R.A., C.B., as Director of Military Intelligence at the War Office.

18. Mr. John Davis, Solicitor-General of the United States, was appointed United States Ambassador in London in succession to Mr. W. H. Page.

19. Opening of an offensive by General Allenby in Palestine.

20. Collapse of the Turkish resistance in Palestine.

21. Resignation of the Japanese Cabinet.

22. The value of the meat coupon was reduced from 5*d.* to 4*d.* The retail price of meat was raised 2*d.* per lb.

23. End of the strike of Lancashire cotton spinners.

— Herr Helfferich resigned his post of German representative in Russia.

— The French captured Prilep from the Bulgarians.

24. A Railway strike which had begun in South Wales spread to London.

25. Celebration of "Italy's Day" in London.

— The British Diplomatic Mission in Brazil was raised from the rank of a Legation to an Embassy, and the Ambassador appointed was Sir Ralph Spencer Paget, K.C.M.G., C.V.O., hitherto Minister at Copenhagen.

25. The railway strike in London came to an end.

— British troops entered Bulgaria opposite Kosturino.

— The Bulgarian military authorities asked for an armistice of forty-eight hours; the request was refused.

26. *The Times* announced that Lord Southborough had accepted the Chairmanship of the two committees investigating the problem of Indian Constitutional Reform.

— Mr. J. H. Thomas tendered his resignation as General Secretary to the National Union of Railwaymen as a protest against the method of those who organised the strike. This resignation he subsequently withdrew.

— Mr. C. E. Ashford, M.V.O., Head Master of the Royal Naval College, Dartmouth, was appointed adviser on education to the Board of Admiralty.

27. The Earl of Lytton was appointed British Commissioner for propaganda in France.

— The British flag was hoisted at Ebeltoft harbour in Spitzbergen.

29. The Belgian Army, under the command of King Albert, captured Dixmude.

— Surrender of a force of 10,000 Turks in Palestine.

30. Capitulation of Bulgaria.

— Resignation of the German Imperial Chancellor, Count Hertling.

— Captain George Ambrose Lloyd, M.P., was appointed Governor of Bombay in succession to Lord Willingdon, who became Governor of Madras.

— The number of prisoners captured by the British troops in France during August and September amounted to 123,618. During the same period 1,400 guns were captured.

— One of H.M. torpedo-gunboats sunk as the result of a collision, with the loss of one officer and fifty-two men.

— The American steamer *Ticonderoga* was torpedoed, with the loss of ten officers and 111 men.

OCTOBER.

1. Capture of St. Quentin by the French.

— Damascus was occupied by a British Force.

3. British troops captured Le Catelet.

— The King conferred a Peerage upon Captain Sir Charles Bathurst, K.B.E., M.P., who was to represent the Ministry of Food in the House of Lords.

4. Prince Max of Baden was appointed Imperial Chancellor and Foreign Minister for Prussia. The Socialist Deputies, Herr Gröber and Herr Scheidemann, were appointed Secretaries of State without portfolio.

— Germany addressed through Switzerland a Note to President Wilson inviting the opening of Peace negotiations and asking for the immediate conclusion of an armistice.

4. King Ferdinand of Bulgaria abdicated his throne in favour of his son the Crown Prince Boris.

— The Japanese steamer *Hiramo Maru* of Tokio was torpedoed and sunk off the Irish Coast, only twenty-eight persons being saved out of a total of 320.

5. *The Times* reported the sale of the *Daily Chronicle* to an unknown purchaser.

6. French and British warships entered the port of Beirut, finding the town evacuated by the enemy.

— H.M. armed mercantile cruiser *Otranto* had a collision with S.S. *Kashmir*, both vessels carrying American troops; 431 persons were missing, including 335 soldiers.

7. Major-General Sir Frederick Maurice resigned his position as military correspondent of the *Daily Chronicle* and joined the staff of the *Daily News* in a similar capacity.

8. Sir Eric Geddes arrived in Washington at the head of a British Naval Mission.

— President Wilson replied to Germany requiring their retreat to their own territory before the question of an armistice could be considered.

9. The Finnish Landtag elected Prince Friedrich Karl, King of Finland.

10. The Irish mail boat *Leinster*, outward bound from Kingstown, was torpedoed and sunk, with the loss of about 450 persons.

12. The German Government replied to President Wilson agreeing to withdraw from occupied territory, and to satisfy the other demands of the President.

13. Capture of Laon by the French.

14. President Wilson replied again to the Note of Germany.

— The Italians captured Durazzo.

15. Lord Justice Pickford was appointed President of the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty division in succession to the late Sir Samuel Evans.

16. Sir William Tyrrell was appointed Assistant Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

17. Lille was captured by British forces under General Birdwood.

— Ostend was occupied by Vice-Admiral Sir Roger Keyes and was found to have been abandoned by the enemy.

19. The Belgian troops occupied Zeebrugge and Bruges.

20. German reply to the American Note of October 14.

21. Lord Beaverbrook resigned his office as Minister of Information, owing to ill-health.

22. A severe epidemic of influenza reached its height at about this date.

23. The House of Commons voted by 274 votes to 25 that it was desirable to pass a Bill making women eligible as Members of Parliament.

23. President Wilson replied to the German Note of October 20 agreeing to refer the question of an armistice to the Allies.

24. Celebration of "Our Day," when an appeal was made by the Red Cross to the whole Nation and Empire.

26. Occupation of Aleppo by the advance cavalry and armoured cars of General Allenby.

27. Resignation of General von Ludendorff from his post as "First Quartermaster-General" of the German Army. He was succeeded by General von Lossberg.

— The Austro-Hungarian Government accepted all President Wilson's conditions, and asked for the commencement of independent Peace negotiations.

29. The Austrian High Command sought an armistice from the Italian Army Command.

30. Meeting of the Supreme War Council at Versailles.

— An armistice was signed at Mudros Island between the Allied Governments and Turkey.

NOVEMBER.

3. Austria-Hungary signed an armistice with General Diaz.

— Italian troops landed at Trieste.

— British troops entered Valenciennes.

4. The armistice with Austria-Hungary came into operation at 3 P.M.

— The Right Hon. Sir Auckland Geddes, K.C.B., M.P., was appointed President of the Local Government Board in place of the Right Hon. W. Hayes Fisher, M.P., who had resigned. Sir Auckland Geddes continued the duties of Minister of National Service.

— One of H.M. patrol vessels was sunk after a collision, one man being lost.

5. One of H.M. auxiliaries was sunk as the result of a collision; there were no casualties.

6. The American Army occupied Sedan.

8. The German armistice plenipotentiaries received from General Foch the conditions of an armistice, with the condition that they were to be accepted by 11 A.M. on November 11.

— Capture of Maubeuge by the Guards and the 62nd Division.

9. Prince Max of Baden, the German Imperial Chancellor, issued a decree stating that the Kaiser had abdicated. Herr Ebert became Imperial Chancellor in place of Prince Max.

— The Lord Mayor's banquet was held, and in the course of it the Prime Minister announced the abdication of the Kaiser.

— H.M.S. *Britannia* was torpedoed in the western entrance to Gibraltar Straits, thirty-nine officers and 673 men being saved.

11. The armistice was signed with Germany at 5 A.M.

— Hostilities ceased on all fronts at 11 A.M.

12. The Allied fleets passed through the Dardanelles.

— Abdication of the Emperor Karl of Austria.

13. *The Times* announced the appointment of Sir George Cave as a Lord of Appeal in succession to the late Lord Parker.

14. The Admiralty announced that H.M.S. *Audacious* had sunk after striking a mine off the North Irish Coast on October 27, 1914.

— Mr. Bonar Law announced that a General Election would take place on December 14.

— The Labour Party at a Conference held in London decided to sever its connexion with the Coalition, and to withdraw its members from the Government.

— The German force from German East Africa, commanded by General von Lettow-Vorbeck, surrendered in compliance with the terms of the armistice on the Chambezi River in N. Rhodesia.

15. British Naval Representatives at Rosyth met the German delegates who had come to arrange for a carrying out of the naval terms of the armistice.

— Professor Masaryk was elected first President of the Czecho-Slovak Republic.

17. British and Russian troops occupied Baku.

18. Belgian troops entered Brussels.

19. Metz was occupied by the French, and Antwerp by the Belgians.

20. Surrender at Harwich of the first twenty German submarines under the armistice.

21. Surrender off the Firth of Forth of five German battle cruisers, nine battleships, seven light cruisers, and forty-nine destroyers. One destroyer was sunk by a mine on its passage from Germany.

— Prorogation of Parliament.

— Namur was occupied by British detachments.

22. King Albert re-entered Brussels after four years of exile.

— Mr. Clynes resigned the office of Food Controller, and Lord Robert Cecil that of Assistant Foreign Secretary.

25. Marshal Foch entered Strasbourg.

— Dissolution of Parliament. The new Parliament was summoned to meet on January 21.

27. The last German troops left Belgium.

— The King, the Prince of Wales, and Prince Albert left London to visit Paris.

28. The Kaiser signed his formal abdication of the Crown of Prussia and the German Imperial Crown.

29. The King conferred the Order of Merit on Marshal Foch at the British Embassy in Paris.

— The Montenegrin Skupshtina decided to depose King Nicholas, and to unite Montenegro with Serbia under King Peter.

30. *The Times* stated that the number of German submarines to fall victims during the war to British anti-submarine measures was over 200.

DECEMBER.

1. The British Army crossed the German Frontier.

4. Nominations for the General Election were made all over the country. One hundred and seven members were returned unopposed.

— President Wilson left the United States for France.

— H.M.S. *Cassandra* struck a mine in the Baltic, and sank a few hours afterwards.

5. The Court of Appeal dismissed the application of Mr. Godfrey Isaacs for a new trial of his libel action against Sir Charles Hobhouse.

6. The Government conceded the principle of an eight-hour day to railway men.

— Advanced troops of the British Army entered Cologne.

7. Over 100,000 workers in the spinning trade of Lancashire ceased work.

10. The King returned to London on the conclusion of a fortnight's tour in France and Belgium.

12. British advanced troops crossed the Rhine and commenced the occupation of the Cologne bridgehead.

13. President Wilson landed at Brest.

14. Polling took place throughout the country for the election of the new House of Commons.

— Senhor Sidonio Paes, President of the Portuguese Republic, was assassinated at Lisbon.

— The armistice was renewed for one month to January 17, 1919.

16. *The Times* announced the appointment of the Rev. Ernest William Barnes, F.R.S., Master of the Temple, to be Canon of Westminster.

19. Sir Douglas Haig and the Commanders of the British Armies on the Western Front returned to England and received a notable reception in London.

— Arrival of the King of Italy in Paris.

20. *The Times* announced that Sir Eric Geddes had been appointed to co-ordinate Government Departments in regard to demobilisation.

— The Conference of Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates at Berlin passed a resolution in favour of the socialisation of industries.

22. Professor Masaryk, President of the Czecho-Slovak Republic, arrived at Prague and took the oath of loyalty to the Republic.

24. The personal estate of the late Lord Rhondda was estimated at 685,000*l.*

26. President Wilson arrived in London from France, and was received with much enthusiasm.

27. President Wilson, after a conference with Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Balfour, was the chief guest at a State banquet given by the King.

— Announcement of the betrothal of H.R.H. Princess Victoria Patricia of Connaught, to Commander the Hon. Alexander Ramsay, R.N.

28. Announcement that H.M.S. *Calypso* had captured two Bolshevik destroyers near Reval.

— The results of the polls for the General Election were declared, giving a majority of 262 to the Coalition.

30. Visit of President Wilson to Manchester.

31. President Wilson, with his suite and Mrs. Wilson, left London for Paris and Rome.

— The total casualties during the war among all the principal belligerents was estimated at nearly 26,000,000.

— *The Times* fund on behalf of the British Red Cross Society and the Order of St. John amounted to the grand total of 14,250,683*l*.

RETROSPECT

OF

LITERATURE, SCIENCE AND ART IN 1918.

LITERATURE.

THE high price of paper, the continued increase in the rate of wages, and the shortage of labour, combined to increase more than ever the mechanical difficulties in the way of book-production. The total number of books published during the year was therefore smaller than for many years previously, amounting to 7,716 as against 8,131 in 1917. The reduction was mainly noticeable in new editions, which fell by 559. In the number of new works, there was an actual increase of 144, mainly accounted for by increases in sociology, technology, medicine, and poetry. Fiction fell off by 523 volumes, and juvenile literature by 153 volumes. The public demand for books, however, continued to be satisfactory, and appeared to be little affected by the increased prices which all publishers were compelled to establish.

I. BOOKS ON THE WAR.

Submarine and Anti-Submarine, by Henry Newbolt (Longmans, Green & Co.). The thick veil under which have been hidden so many of the concrete details of the war has hitherto hung even more impenetrably over the doings of the Navy than it has over those of the Army. Of the innumerable different kinds of work performed by the Navy, none again has been more strictly concealed from publicity than that of the submarine and anti-submarine service. Few subjects can therefore be so engrossing to an Englishman as an account—such as at last has been permitted to appear—of this supremely important factor in the war. It was indeed known vaguely that achievements of the highest glory were being daily carried out by the Senior Service. But any expectations which were roused are far and away exceeded by the reality of this fascinating book. Sir Henry Newbolt describes the various methods by which the German submarines were attacked, and at last defeated. He describes also the achievements of the British submarines, their domination of the Baltic and the Dardanelles, the heroism of their crews. The mysteries of the Q-boats are at length unveiled; and finally the memorable story of the blocking of the harbours of Ostend and Zeebrugge. In the result, we have a book which outdoes any mere

tale of imaginative adventure. It shows, of course, what none had ever doubted, how brilliantly our sailors have maintained the traditions of the Navy. It shows even more: that in various directions they have surpassed anything that had been done in our previous history. We find everywhere complete and utter indifference to any danger, in combination with high scientific judgment and knowledge. It is fortunate that so great a theme fell into the hands of Sir Henry Newbolt, who of all writers is most fitted by his knowledge, literary skill, and natural sentiments, to deal adequately with it. The book is one of the most interesting and important published during the year.

Alsace-Lorraine ; Past, Present, and Future, by Coleman Phillipson, Litt.D., etc. (Fisher Unwin), is an extensive, scholarly, and temperate study of what is, without doubt, the most critical and most important territorial problem in the world. Dr. Phillipson is a well-known writer on international affairs, and readers of his "International Law and the Great War," or of his "Termination of War and Treaties of Peace," will expect to find in the present volume a serious investigation of the Alsatian question, and they will not be disappointed. The book opens with a description of the two provinces and gives a summary (somewhat too brief) of their history. The existing problem is stated, and in Chapters IV. to VIII. a lengthy account is given of the seizure in 1871. Chapter IX. describes the German régime in the provinces, and states that the material progress under German administration was undoubtedly very marked. The next chapter deals with the opinions and aspirations of the people of the provinces, and in particular lays much stress on the recent growth of the nationalist movement. Chapter XI. describes the attitude of the French towards Alsace-Lorraine, the evanescence of the *rêvanche* ideal in recent years, until it revived after the outbreak of the great war. The remaining six chapters deal with the proposed solutions of the problem; namely, forcible reannexation to France, partition of the territory, autonomy within the German Empire, the erection of Alsace-Lorraine as an independent state: also with the question of a plebiscite. Every chapter is interesting and full of valuable information.

It will be seen that the question is discussed from all points of view. An elementary knowledge of the historic and racial facts is now fairly widespread in England. The gradual conquest of the territories by France during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries; the successful fusion of the country with France, in sentiment and political ideals, though not (for the most part) in language; and the famous protest of the deputies of Alsace-Lorraine against the annexation in 1871: all these matters are now fairly well understood in this country. There are other relevant points, however, which are not so well known. For instance, in the Franco-German feud, the economic value of the "lost provinces" now plays an important part. The author deals with this aspect of the matter in Chapter XIII. Lorraine is immensely rich in iron. Three-fourths of the annual production of iron in Germany before the war came from the mines of Lorraine and Luxemburg. And it is computed, also, that these same mines contain three-fourths of the total iron resources of the German Empire. The

economic factor thus introduces a complication. The Germans really need this iron. The French have plenty of iron. On the other hand, the Germans possess a superabundance of coal, and the French have very little coal. Some Frenchmen wish to annex the Saar valley, with its rich coalfields, as well as Alsace-Lorraine, but the Saar district is indisputably a part of Germany. In other words, unfortunately, what the Germans need is in Lorraine, and what the French need is just over the border in real German territory. The author's solution is one which is obvious enough, even though it may be very difficult of realisation. He proposes that there should be Free Trade in these minerals between France, Germany, and Alsace-Lorraine.

Another point which is often imperfectly realised is the strength of the autonomist or nationalist movement in Alsace-Lorraine. In recent years the country has developed a character of its own, distinct alike from that of Germany and from that of France. Dr. Phillipson is evidently much in sympathy with this movement.

After a very fair discussion of the whole problem, the author comes to the conclusion that the people of the provinces should be allowed to decide their own destiny by means of a plebiscite. He suggests that natives who have left the country within the last ten years, and Germans who have resided in the country more than ten years, should be allowed to take part in the ballots. Finally, whilst admitting the danger of prophecies, Dr. Phillipson says that he ventures to express his belief "that a plebiscite organised before the present war on the lines suggested would have resulted in favour of autonomy within the German Empire, and if organised now will result in favour of neutralised independence."

The author says that he has aimed throughout at perfect impartiality, and it seems to us that in this he has, on the whole, been remarkably successful. He is certainly fair, perhaps not really more than fair, to Germany. He is much in sympathy, as already stated, with the nationalist movement in the provinces. But we are not quite sure that he allows due weight to the distinctively French point of view. The seizure of Alsace-Lorraine in 1870 is not in the category of ancient wrongs, the actors in and victims of which have all been dead long since, and which are much better forgotten. If it were, the case for a plebiscite would be much stronger, and, indeed, unanswerable. But the seizure is a recent event. Consider the population of the provinces who were between the ages of 15 and 30 in 1871. A large proportion of these people are still alive. These persons were grievously wronged in their youth. Does not abstract justice demand that it is the rights of these persons which should have first consideration? This point should perhaps have been brought out more forcibly. Yet if Alsace and Lorraine be restored to France unconditionally, the French Government will require both wisdom and tact. In particular, they will need to display tolerance in religious matters. And there is also the danger that all over Europe much more importance is now attached to linguistic affinity than was the case half a century ago.

It should be added that the book was published early in the year, before the victory of the Associated Powers. It is curious that the

author should fail to give full value to the French case in regard to Alsace-Lorraine; but, on the other hand, he is obviously right in condemning the wild (and probably irresponsible) schemes to annex the Saar valley and other parts of western Germany.

German Colonies: A Plea for the Native Races, by Sir Hugh Clifford (John Murray), is one of the ablest and best-informed dissertations upon the colonial question which have been published. Sir Hugh Clifford was at this time Governor of the Gold Coast, and he has made a close study of the history of colonising, not only in Africa, but in the extra-European world generally. The book, though small, contains a mass of condensed information, much of which can only be discovered elsewhere scattered through various works of reference and such like. The main object of the book is to bring out the contrast which exists between the British and German methods of colonial administration, the utter selfishness of the latter and the sense of responsibility for the welfare of the natives exhibited (at least in recent times) by the former. The author exposes the inordinate powers over the natives given to petty officials, and even to unofficial Germans, by the German system, and, in particular, he describes the appalling ruthlessness with which the Herrero campaign was waged. In addition to the unlicensed tyranny of Europeans, the native population in German colonies was exposed to the arrogance of black soldiers, who were made a privileged caste, and this explains, incidentally, the loyalty undoubtedly shown by the negro soldiers—but not therefore by the general population—in German East Africa during the war. In describing the history of colonisation, the author also condemns Dutch colonial methods, perhaps too strongly. In certain directions the Dutch have excelled, notably in applying promptly the discoveries of tropical medicine. The author ends by urging very strongly that to return these colonies to Germany would be an iniquitous betrayal of the native populations. Nearly all Englishmen will agree with him in this matter, and there is no doubt that his strictures upon the German administrations are only too well justified. As a matter of historic fact, however, it needs to be remembered that colonial atrocities are not peculiar to the Germans. The records of the Spanish, Portuguese, Belgians, and (quite recently) the Italians are none too good; and in earlier days there were dark stains even on British colonies, as witness the fate of the Tasmanians, Beothuks, and Bushmen. Modern British (and American) colonial methods stand in a class alone, but it is right to remember that our conduct has not always been on the same high plane.

Secrets of the Bosphorus, by Henry Morgenthau (Hutchinson & Co.), is one of the most interesting books on the political side of the war, because the author was a witness of some of the more important happenings. Mr. Morgenthau was American Ambassador at Constantinople during the years 1913 to 1916, and he was thus brought into contact not only with the members of the Ottoman Government who plunged Turkey into war, but also with the German schemers at Constantinople, which was a veritable nest of German intrigue. The author is himself the son of German Jews who emigrated to America, but he had no sympathy whatever with Germany. The villain of Mr.

Morgenthau's story is Baron von Wangenheim, the German Ambassador to Turkey. This man is painted as an arch-schemer, and if the picture be not overdrawn he was certainly an almost incredibly cynical character. One of the first incidents described in the book is the arrival of the *Goeben* and the *Breslau* in the Bosphorus, and that occurrence must undoubtedly have been dramatic. But the incident which has caused most discussion, and which has made this book famous, is a conversation between Wangenheim and Morgenthau in which the former related to the author how he had taken part in an Imperial Conference at Potsdam on 5 July, 1914, at which, so it appeared, the plans for the war were laid. From this conversation the American Ambassador gained the impression, which, he tells us, the official "coloured" books issued from Berlin and Vienna were quite unable to remove, that the German Government were not only willing to risk war over the Sarajevo incident, and were prepared for it, but were actually desirous that the assassination should lead to a general war. "It is quite apparent," he says, "that this crime merely served as the convenient pretext for the war upon which the Central Empires had already decided." The later chapters of the book are also most interesting. There is much about the Armenian massacres. Mr. Morgenthau does not accuse the German Government of instigating these atrocities, but he says that the Germans manifested callous indifference in regard to them. The author relates in another place the complete failure of the attempt to modernise the Ottoman State; this attempt had failed even before the war. Early in 1916 Mr. Morgenthau left Turkey, where his solicitude for the Armenians had made him very unpopular, and returned to America via Berlin. In Berlin he met Herr von Jagow (then Foreign Minister) and other prominent personages. His conversation with von Jagow makes interesting reading, and it appears that even at that time this German statesman was hoping for the eventual understanding with Great Britain which he had always desired. Yet the ignorance of foreign countries displayed even by such a relatively moderate and well-informed German as von Jagow is truly astonishing. The book is throughout very interesting, though the author manifests a certain naïveté and credulity which are characteristic of some Americans. His view of Europe is that of a superficial though very well-meaning diplomat, not that of a historian. There are also a number of inaccuracies on questions of fact, of which the most glaring (perhaps a printer's error) is that the wrong date is given for the Austro-Hungarian ultimatum to Serbia.

General Smuts' Campaign in East Africa, by Brigadier-General J. H. V. Crowe, C.B. (John Murray), is, as its authorship would imply, a serious military history of what was undoubtedly the most difficult colonial campaign waged during the Great War. The volume covers only the period indicated in the title, and says scarcely anything about the fighting in East Africa before General Smuts' arrival or after his departure. It is therefore not a history of the East African Campaign as a whole, and after perusing the book one is left with the wish that the author had undertaken the larger task, even though he would not have had the same personal experience of the earlier and later portions

of the campaign. General Crowe was in command of the Royal Artillery in Smuts' miscellaneous army, and his book, though not always very lively in style, is extremely lucid, and it is obvious that the author has taken great pains to make his narrative an accurate record of the events. It will be remembered that General Smuts was only in East Africa for about eleven months, from February, 1916, to January, 1917, but this was the decisive period of the campaign. In 1914 and 1915 the Germans had had the better of the fighting, the British attempts at taking the offensive in the earlier years having met with little success, and having, in some cases, ended in rather ignominious disasters. During 1916, however, the decisive blows were struck, and when Smuts departed (earlier than he himself really desired, though he was needed at the Imperial War Conference) all the important centres had been taken, and the German force, though still in being, had ceased to be anything more than a fugitive band. German East Africa, like all the German colonies, was unprepared for war, but the officials and colonists, thrown upon their own resources, were better able to improvise resistance than were the inhabitants of the other German colonies. They were a much larger community than the colonists in Kamerun, and unlike the people of South-West Africa, they had a very large, fairly friendly, and fairly warlike native population from which to recruit additional soldiers. Their chief difficulty was lack of arms and ammunition, but they secured not inconsiderable supplies of munitions from the stranded cruiser *Königsberg* and from several ships which successfully ran the British blockade. The English have been very ready to pay a tribute to the German commander-in-chief, General von Lettow-Vorbeck. It seems to be true that he was a most determined leader and a not unchivalrous opponent, but, according to General Crowe's account, he appears to have been constantly outwitted and outmanœuvred by the wily Boer strategist. Including non-combatants and porters the German force consisted of about 30,000 men, of whom about 2,000 were whites. The Britannic Army under Smuts was, of course, made up of very diverse elements. Troops from the South African Union, British, Indians, East Africans (white and black), West African regiments, Rhodesians, and other contingents—all these co-operated in the campaign. The geographic and climatic difficulties were unprecedented, and the Germans had the advantage of superior mobility throughout the campaign. The course of the operations is illustrated by four good maps, and it may be repeated that the careful narration of details makes the book a pleasure to read. It was first published in July, and a second edition was issued in November.

With the Austrian Army in Galicia, by Octavian C. Taslauanu (Skeffington & Son), is a war-book which is altogether unique in character. It is described by the publishers as "the first and only description in English of the great Russian Invasion of Galicia in the first months told from the other side." The author was a Rumanian-speaking subject of the Hungarian crown, and he was an officer in the "Honved" or Hungarian Territorial Army. He was, even before the war, an ardent Rumanian nationalist, and he was Secretary of the Society for promoting Rumanian culture in Hungary. It will be

remembered that in the district of Hungary known as Transylvania (or, as the Rumanians call it, *Ardéal*) the Rumanians are a majority—though only a small majority—of the population, and the author is an enthusiastic propagandist of the idea of uniting this district to the kingdom of Rumania.

The book, however, is something much more than a political tract. It contains, in fact, no unnecessary political arguments, and the hopes of the author's compatriots are by no means unduly thrust into the story. The book is, indeed, an absorbingly interesting record of personal experiences. It reads more like an unusually interesting and exciting historical novel than any other war-book which we have read. Nearly all Englishmen are totally unfamiliar with the peoples and provinces of East-Central Europe which come into this tale, and even such knowledge of the countries as has been recently attained is mostly in the nature of an estimate of so many ciphers in the vexed problem of nationalities. But in this book all the nationalities are thoroughly alive, and the story gains rather than loses from the fact that the author is himself imbued with all manner of nationalist and other prejudices. We read of the shifty and treacherous Jews, the mean Ruthenians, the rather likeable Saxons (not the real Saxons, but the German-speaking people of Transylvania), the tyrannous Magyars, and the more tolerant and even-handed Austrians. The Hungarians are, of course, the author's special bugbear. He has good reason to hate Magyar tyranny, though his aspersions on Magyar courage cannot be taken very seriously, in view of the martial reputation of that nation. His remarks on this point are, however, very interesting as displaying his own intense hatred of the ruling people. The author was only at the front for a few months, but he saw some very severe fighting, and the descriptions of the engagements are most realistic. The story is naturally not without its ghastly side, and in particular a description of the corpse of a fine young Russian soldier may haunt the mind of the reader. M. Taslauanu seems to have fought willingly enough (and, it is easy to infer, with unusual personal courage) so long as he was only opposed to Russians, but he was utterly sickened when he found his battalion facing a regiment of his "compatriots"—Rumanian-speaking subjects of the Tsar from Bessarabia. The author became ill, and before Christmas he was granted sick-leave, and returned home to his own town of Sibiiu. He became more and more disgusted with the treatment that he and his friends received from the Hungarian authorities, and he finally decided to desert. He managed his escape cleverly, and in April, 1915, he got across the frontier into Rumania.

As a picture of life and war in these countries, the book is, as already stated, quite extraordinarily interesting. But perhaps the tangle of nationalist enthusiasms and prejudices to be found thereabouts will leave the distant foreign reader somewhat cold. Truth to tell, these rivalries become somewhat inhuman. One is left with an admiration and affection for the author, not because of his rather narrow patriotism, about which he says so much, but because of his splendid personal courage, about which he says nothing directly, and of which he seems almost unconscious. Yet M. Taslauanu is constantly

striking one very human note. He has a quick eye for the fair sex. And there is one Magyar, at all events, of whom he can say something good. At one stopping-place on the journey to Galicia, he found himself suddenly embraced by a beautiful Hungarian woman, who proposed that he should return and marry her. "It will," he says, "take me a long time to forget her pink cheeks and fine eyes." This is better than racialism!

The Kaiser I Knew, by Arthur N. Davis (Hodder & Stoughton), is an interesting book of intimate gossip about the Emperor William II. and his family. Mr. Davis, who is an American citizen, was a resident in Berlin for fifteen years, and for fourteen years he was the Kaiser's Court Dentist. There is no very original revelation relating to the Kaiser's character or plans, but the numerous anecdotes have much interest, and the incidents are no doubt accurately recorded. The Emperor is shown to be peculiarly frivolous and volatile, and his ideas of policy, even where Germany herself was concerned, were painfully puerile. And the extraordinary ignorance of America and other foreign countries displayed by the monarch and the Imperial family would be almost incredible, if it had not been recorded by Mr. Davis and other reliable witnesses. Soon after war broke out Mr. Davis was compelled to listen to constant complaints against his country, from the Emperor and others, by reason of the fact that the United States was sending munitions to the Allies, and there is no doubt that this irrational grievance was the source of much bitterness in Germany. This fury naturally reached fever heat after America entered the war, and it was then that the Kaiser suddenly burst out with the remark, "Davis, Wilson is a real scoundrel," though a few moments later he apologised not ungraciously. The Imperial family appear to have quite misjudged the attitude of the German-Americans, and to have overestimated their influence. Mr. Davis also came into contact with the Empress, the Crown Prince, the Crown Princess (whom he rather liked), and other prominent personages. The Crown Prince is shown up once more as a painfully irresponsible and egotistical coxcomb. Mr. Davis exhibits, however, no animosity against the German people as a whole. He thinks that they were deceived, and that all, or nearly all, the blame for the war should be attached to the governing clique.

War and Revolution in Asiatic Russia, by M. Philips Price (George Allen & Unwin), is one of the very best books on recent events in Russia. Few Englishmen know European Russia so well as Mr. Price, and certainly none know Asiatic Russia better than he. Some years before the war, the author (then only recently down from Cambridge), went on an exploring expedition into the heart of Central Asia, and he then formed a very bad opinion of the Tsarist régime. Immediately after war broke out, he returned to Russia as special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*. He witnessed the great Russian disasters in Galicia in 1915, but after that he betook himself to the Caucasus, where he remained during the latter half of 1915 and throughout 1916. The book covers a wide field. Part I. is a history of the Caucasus Campaign from 1914 to 1916, and is much the best account—indeed, almost the only connected account—published up to date. There is a long "In-

roduction" to the book in which Mr. Price discusses in a philosophical manner the consequences of the important geographical position occupied by the Caucasus, which he styles the southern "gateway" between Europe and Asia. In this section the author displays a most intimate acquaintance with the geographical and ethnographical details of this wild region. His description of the Georgians is particularly interesting. Being members of the Greek Church, these people have always looked to Europe for sympathy and for culture, and Mr. Price says that "the Russian advance into the Caucasus was very materially assisted by the presence beyond the mountain ranges of a race of co-religionists." In regard to the fate of Constantinople, and the Baghdad Railway, which ought to be a great commercial highway, he suggests internationalisation. In his history of the Caucasus campaign, Mr. Price throws some light upon the indirect effects of the Dardanelles expedition. He says that after the great German advance in Galicia, the position in the Caucasus became very menacing to Russia, since that Power had been obliged to send nearly all her available forces to the Polish front. The Turks were therefore in a dominant position, but the peril to Constantinople compelled them in their turn to withdraw forces from Armenia. The capture of Erzerum in February, 1916, is described very clearly and in great detail, and the reader is able to appreciate the amazing marches accomplished by certain Turkestan regiments. In capturing Erzerum the Russians repaid the service rendered them at the Dardanelles, for this attack "in its turn saved the British from being driven completely out of Mesopotamia." Part II. of the book is made up from the author's diary, and from his articles in the *Manchester Guardian*, and describes his journeyings in Caucasia, Armenia, and Persia. Mr. Price speaks very highly of the American and English missionaries in Turkey and Persia. The last three chapters are political, and deal with Armenia, with the growth of nationalism in the Caucasus, and with the Russian Revolution. Mr. Price describes various massacres by the Russians, particularly those in Turkestan in 1916, news of which was suppressed at the time. The author writes with great enthusiasm of the Russian Revolution, but he completed the book before the Bolshevik *coup d'état* at the end of 1917, and it is possible that he has modified his opinions since then. Whatever we may think of the author's views on the revolution or of his unbounded belief in democracy, there is no doubt that, as a keen and sympathetic observer of the great events which he witnessed, he has been able to write a very valuable history of important aspects of the stupendous cataclysm in the East.

Dr. Muehlon's Diary (Cassell) is a book which attracted very considerable attention during the year. Dr. Muehlon was formerly a Director of Krupp's Armament firm, but even before the war he seems to have felt humane sentiments and to have detested the whole system of human slaughter. He was an enlightened Liberal, who hated the policies of the Prussian and Hungarian chauvinists. On the original issue as between Serbia and Austria-Hungary, he held that the whole miserable controversy ought to have been forestalled by Vienna by the grant of genuine "home-rule all round" on national lines to the various

diverse peoples of the Dual Monarchy. Like all real Liberals in Central Europe, Dr. Muehlton lays great blame upon the Magyars. The diary covers only the first few months of the war, but it is amply sufficient to prove that the writer was immediately horrified at what was happening, particularly at the invasion of Belgium. His comments (dated Sept. 2, 1914) on the British Blue Book are also very interesting, and remind the reader forcibly of Prince Lichnowsky's famous pamphlet. On the whole, he praises the British attitude, and realises that Grey was endeavouring to work for peace. He makes, however, a criticism which has also come from entirely different quarters in England and elsewhere. He says: "But I nevertheless have the feeling that it would have been better if Germany had been compelled to reckon definitely on finding England on the side of France. No doubt Grey was unable to show his hand more clearly at the outset; but had he been able to do so, I can't help thinking that Germany and Austria-Hungary would have given up their warlike attitude." The author is condemnatory of many of the aspects of German life, but his disgust with the servility of the press knows no bounds. After remaining in Germany for some time after the outbreak of war, Dr. Muehlton escaped into Switzerland, and there had the opportunity to publish this diary, the first edition being of course in German.

Boundaries in Europe and the Near East, by Colonel Sir Thomas H. Holdich, K.C.M.G., C.B. (Macmillan & Co.), is a book which consists of a series of suggestions as to the frontiers which should be drawn after the close of the European War. The author approaches the subject from the military point of view, and throughout the book a constant discordance between the strategic requirements and the ethnographical distribution of the populations is forced upon the reader's attention. As might be expected, the author is at his best in dealing with purely strategic questions, and on these problems all that he says deserves serious consideration. A principle which he is constantly emphasising is that rivers (unless they be "bordered by broad bands of swamp and mud") are *not* good military boundaries, since they do not form effective obstacles to aggression. On the other hand, he says that the strength of defensive positions on lines of elevation has been demonstrated by the events of the Great War. The acceptance of this principle naturally has important consequences. Thus the author holds that the Rhine would not be a good defensive frontier for France, and that on the contrary, from the purely military point of view, it would be advantageous for her to keep within the boundary of the Vosges and forego the reannexation of Alsace. Lorraine, on the other hand, he thinks is strategically part of France.

Successive chapters deal with the Near East, Italy, the Czechs and Slovaks, a Jugò-Slav Federation, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania and Greece, Poland, Russia, Turkey, Syria and Mesopotamia, and Alsace-Lorraine. Probably most readers will turn first to the last chapter. Another interesting and well-written chapter is that on Poland, but neither the author nor anybody else can find satisfactory strategic frontiers for that unhappy country, except, of course, on the south-east where the Carpathians serve the purpose excellently. The end of this

chapter is unfortunately marred (on page 154) by the fact that the author (or his printer) twice speaks of East Prussia where West Prussia is evidently intended. He is moreover mistaken in thinking (as he apparently does think, if we understand the printer's error aright) that there is a Polish majority in West Prussia. All the other chapters are interesting, and from the strategic point of view are valuable. On political questions the author cannot be taken very seriously, and he makes no kind of attempt at impartiality. Thus he would hand over Alsace to France on the ground of sentiment and sympathies, even though this would give France a weaker frontier, and yet he would not give the German-speaking district of Bohemia (a veritable Continental "Ulster") to Germany because to do so would spoil the Bohemian frontier. He admits elsewhere that in forming states the "will" of the people concerned should be taken into consideration, but he makes the extraordinary statement that this will "is certainly not governed by any principles of community of origin and language." In point of fact, it is by those very considerations that the "will" is usually, though of course not always, governed.

The Last of the Romanoffs, by Charles Rivet (Constable & Co.), is a translation of one of the best French books on the Russian Revolution. M. Rivet, as Petrograd correspondent of the Paris *Temps*, was a witness of the events which gave rise to the revolution, and his description of the different factors in Russian life and politics is most instructive, and in some respects surprising. The author is an even more convinced and consistent believer in democracy than are most Frenchmen, and he welcomed the revolution with enthusiasm. Even the cessation of Russian military activity seems to have left him undismayed. He had, however, always been a critic of the Franco-Russian Alliance, on the ground that it was a stain upon French honour to support this wicked barbarism, and that, in the long run, it could not be to France's interest to do so. He was, therefore, perhaps somewhat too ready to overlook the dangers which were inherent in the triumph of that revolutionary cause with which he had always sympathised. M. Rivet urges that there was, all the alliances notwithstanding, an essential and real affinity between the great despotisms of Europe, and that in reality they served to support one another. He therefore holds that the collapse of the great despotism of the East was the surest guarantee of the ultimate downfall, beyond hope of restoration, of the great monarchies of Central Europe. The thesis has the merit of originality. The book has an introduction by Hardress O'Grady.

Air-fare of To-day and of the Future, by Edgar C. Middleton (Constable & Co.), is one of the best of the many books published on the developments and possibilities of aviation. The author demonstrates that the development of aerial navigation has changed in an extraordinary manner the conditions of human existence, not only in war, but in peace also. The advance of the aeroplane in war is now notorious and needs little emphasis. A single fact is eloquent of the progress made. During the one month of September, 1918, the British Army and Air Service in France destroyed nearly 600 German aeroplanes. This illustrates the enormous scale on which air-fare was waged at the end of the war, and

also the stupendous demands made upon the manufacturers of the machines. The record for altitude has also risen enormously during the war, and at the end of 1918 was over 30,000 feet; that is, higher than the highest mountain in the world. The author tells us that the average speed of aeroplanes has also much increased during the war, and that the climbing power of machines has now reached a rate of 2,000 feet per minute—a most amazing achievement. It is possible that the author is too enthusiastic over the heavier-than-air machines, as compared with airships. Aeronautics will probably have a great place in the future as well as aviation, and, under conditions of peace, the airship is likely to be in many respects superior to the aeroplane.

Deductions from the World War, by Lieutenant-General Baron von Freytag-Loringhoven (Constable), is a translation of a German book which attracted a great deal of attention in the early part of the year. The author was one of the highest officers in the German General Staff, and his deductions from the war were therefore held to have an importance greater than they might have possessed if they had only come from a private individual. In so far as strategy and tactics are concerned the author has little which is really original to say, but in justice to him, on the professional side it must be noted that since the war was continuing when he wrote, his vagueness on these matters may well have been intentional. Some of his observations on tactics are indeed almost amusingly trite. But the importance of the book was due to the fact that the author discussed what might be called the philosophy of war, and the theory which he propounded was the old-time conservative view as opposed to modern internationalism. War, he says, has its basis in human nature, and in order to rid the world of war human nature itself must be changed. The German General had no faith whatever in the idea of a League of Nations, and he believed that the only policy for Germany was to adopt the position of the "strong man armed." In order to convince his German readers of the soundness of this view he makes great play with the universal hatred which he says has been stirred up against Germany. It was believed at the time, and certainly for very good reasons, that the German Government deliberately put forward this able if cynical writer, in order to combat the internationalist views then being spread by the German socialists.

Fighting for Peace, by Henry Van Dyke (Hodder & Stoughton), is another of those books which go to show that the old adage that "the looker-on sees most of the game" has much truth in it. Dr. Van Dyke was the United States Minister at The Hague, and his book contains not only an interesting account of his own experiences there during the war, but also includes a forcible argument on the rights of the war from a somewhat new and original point of view. Dr. Van Dyke appears to have had a great deal of work in assisting his own fellow-countrymen fleeing from the various belligerent countries, and he was also active in rendering assistance to unfortunate Belgians, particularly at the beginning of the war. At one period he also came into touch with the network of German and Austro-Hungarian intrigue. And it appears that an attempt was made to induce him to send cypher messages for the Austro-Hungarian Government, just as Swedish

diplomats were used in certain notorious cases. But Dr. Van Dyke was more sagacious than his Swedish colleagues. In regard to the controversy about the origin of the war, the author brings forward strong reasons for believing that the German Government was entirely in collusion with Vienna in the matter of the Austro-Hungarian ultimatum to Serbia. Throughout his book this American diplomat reveals himself as being almost completely in sympathy with the Entente point of view, particularly in the matter of submarine warfare. In regard to the Dutch he says that they were before all things "pro-Dutch," and that this sentiment quite eclipsed sympathy for any of the belligerents.

II. GENERAL LITERATURE.

Traditions of British Statesmanship. Some comments on *Passing Events*, by the Hon. Arthur D. Elliot (Constable & Co., Ltd.). The events of the war have been on so large a scale, and have so completely monopolised public attention, that few persons who have lived through it can view it in its proper perspective in relation to the preceding course of history and politics. This difficult task is achieved with singular success in the present book. The author possesses in a high degree the two essential qualifications of a deep knowledge of English politics during last century, and an admirably balanced judgment which cannot be shaken even amid the general upheaval of warlike sentiment. He indicates first the general lines of British Foreign Policy in the past, pointing how little it has been affected by changes in Government, and how consistently it has been animated by the ideals of peace. He then goes on to trace the growth of ill-feeling between Great Britain and Germany, describes the circumstances of the outbreak of war, and subsequent political developments in this country. He defends the pre-war naval and military policy of Great Britain, points out that it was successful, when war actually broke out, in playing the part for which it had been designed, and attacks the views of those who, like Mr. F. S. Oliver, criticise what they regard as our unpreparedness for war. Considerable space is devoted to Ireland, the attitude adopted being, of course, strongly Unionist. Thus the book not only presents a valuable historical study, but has the additional advantage (none too common in books of knowledge and insight) that it is written in a remarkably lucid and attractive style, which makes it easy and interesting to read. Although printed before the armistice, it was not published till December.

A General Sketch of European Literature, in the *Centuries of Romance*, by Laurie Magnus (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.). This useful volume owes its origination to a suggestion by the late Professor E. Dowden, who drew attention to the need for an "outline map" which would fix once for all in the minds of students the main landmarks of European literature. The present volume itself is the first of three, which the author hopes in course of time to complete. We are here taken through the *Centuries of Romance*, *i.e.*, from the twelfth century down to 1637, the date of the foundation of the French Academy, and Richelieu's enrolment of Corneille. It is intended that the two

remaining volumes shall deal respectively with "the epochs of *bon sens* and of romance revived."

Mr. Magnus has executed his task with skill and success, and the book in itself is a monument of industry. The division of literature into periods is necessarily somewhat arbitrary, but as satisfactory as could be obtained in dealing with a subject of general continuity. It leads, however, to some anomalies. It is perhaps natural to include Milton and Calderon in the present volume; but the inclusion of Piers Plowman in the "Age of Dante" and his exclusion from "The Fourteenth Century" is more remarkable, seeing that his work belongs entirely to the fourteenth century, and that he was not born till nearly a decade after Dante's death. Mr. Magnus, however, pays more attention to the spirit than to the letter of his different periods, and thereby escapes, indeed, much of the arbitrariness of a classification. The style is pleasant and unassuming—perhaps even too unassuming for the magnitude of the subject. The book should take its place as an invaluable guide to the literature of the centuries dealt with.

A History of American Literature, Volume I. Edited by W. P. Trent, Professor of English in Columbia University; John Erskine, Professor of English in Columbia University; Stuart P. Sherman, Professor of English in the University of Illinois; Carl van Doren, Head Master of the Breasley School (The Cambridge University Press). This history of American Literature is described as being supplementary to the "Cambridge History of English Literature." The preface by the four editors calls attention to its chief distinctive features: "It is on a larger scale than any of its predecessors which have carried the story from colonial times to the present generation. It is the first history of American literature composed with the collaboration of a numerous body of scholars from every section of the United States and from Canada. It will provide for the first time an extensive bibliography for all periods and subjects treated. It will be a survey of the life of the American people as expressed in their writings rather than a history of *belles-lettres* alone." This first volume of the series is divided into two books, the first dealing with Colonial and Revolutionary literature; and the second with early National literature. The former opens with a chapter by George Paulin Winship, on the writings of the early travellers and explorers—wonderful records of courage and tenacity. Professor J. S. Bassett follows with an article on the historians who wrote between 1607 and 1783, and next there is an article by V. L. Partridge on the Puritan Divines of the seventeenth century. Paul Elmer More has an article on the strange mystic, Jonathan Edwards, which is placed next to one on Benjamin Franklin, his exact opposite, by S. P. Sherman. The first book ends with articles on Colonial newspapers and magazines during 1704 to 1776; on American political writings, and on the beginnings of verse, 1610 to 1808, by Elizabeth Christine Cook, William MacDonald, and Samuel Marion Tucker respectively. The second book begins with a chapter on the writings of travellers and observers from 1763 to 1846, by Professor Lane Cooper, and a fascinating article on the Early Drama by A. H. Quin. Perhaps to English readers the articles on Washington Irving and Emerson are among the most interesting in the

book. Every Englishman has read the "Sketch Book," and Emerson is as well known in England as in America. William Leonard has an article on "Bryant and the Minor Poets"—we in England have had the bad taste to class Bryant as a minor poet—but he certainly stands above the "minor poets" of his age and country. The chapter on Fiction by Carl van Doren will remind many people of their childish delight in Fennimore Cooper's story of "The Spy,"—they may possibly ask themselves if they could wade through it now. The chapter on New England Transcendentalism as expounded and practised by Channing, Thoreau, Alcott, and others, is extremely interesting as being entirely American in its growth and outlook, although its mysticism had a certain relationship with oriental mysticism. The article is very sympathetically written by H. C. Goddard, who considers American transcendentalism to be a phase of a world-wide movement, religious rather than political, and the natural outcome of Puritanism. Needless to say the rank and file did not live up to the level of the leaders, and Emerson describes the Chardon Street convention which was held in Boston in 1840, as "Madmen, mad women, men with beards, Dunkers, Muggletonians, Comeouters, Groaners, Agrarians, Seventh-day Baptists, Quakers, Abolitionists, Calvinists, Unitarians, and Philosophers." Alcott, the father of Mary Alcott, the authoress of "Little Women," was specially singled out as a target for the jests of an unsympathetic public. His schemes were not successful, as few people would allow their children to attend his school when he insisted on receiving a coloured child to educate with their own; and his community of Fruitland, which was to be a miniature Utopia, was a dismal failure. The index and extremely fine bibliographies should make this book valuable to scholars as well as charming to the ordinary reader.

Life of Frederick Courtenay Selous, D.S.O., by J. G. Millais, F.Z.S. (Longmans, Green & Co.). This is one of the most attractive biographies of the year. The author well brings out the delightful personality of his hero, who must excite in all readers not only admiration, but affection. Selous had a mind of conspicuous simplicity and sincerity. His absolute truthfulness differentiates him from many travellers in unknown regions, and greatly increases the pleasure with which the book may be read. His life is the story of a succession of hunting expeditions of the highest interest, in which many of his friends were killed, and he himself had a number of hairbreadth escapes. He had the roving and adventurous disposition which rebels against the quiet life of a civilised country; and must always be regarded as one of the most notable pioneers of the Empire in Africa. Notwithstanding the fact that his life was full of adventure and excitement, he appears to have often suffered from fits of depression, due especially to the difficulty of making a living from the trade of a hunter. The biography is written with much sympathy and insight, though the literary expression is occasionally awkward. An example may be cited of one sentence, which is unhappily worded: "After dinner he [Selous] would begin telling stories, and at 1.30 was still hard at it when most of us were dying to go to bed." Selous warmly condemned the policy which led up to the Boer war, and with his natural courage and sincerity did not hesitate to speak his

views, at a time when they were extremely unpopular. He was imbued, however, with a high patriotism, which led him to join the Army as a subaltern when over 60 years of age, to fight the Germans. He received the D.S.O. shortly before being killed in action. Few persons of his generation so much deserve to be commemorated in a biography.

Memoir of John Michell, F.R.S., by Sir Archibald Geikie, O.M., K.C.B., F.R.S., etc. (Cambridge University Press), is a small but adequate biography of an eminent scientific man of the eighteenth century, whose merits as a pioneer in research have been hitherto somewhat overlooked. The value of Michell's work was really very great, and Sir A. Geikie decided to write this book in order to secure for him the credit which is his due. Michell was born in 1724, and had a distinguished career at Queen's College, Cambridge, being elected a Fellow of that College in 1749. In 1760 he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society, and in 1762 he became Woodwardian Professor of Geology at Cambridge, a post which he held for only two years. He was Rector of St. Botolph's, Cambridge, from 1760 to 1763. After holding two benefices in Hampshire, he was instituted Rector of Thornhill, near Dewsbury, in Yorkshire, where he remained for the remainder of his life. He died in his sixty-ninth year. Michell's scientific investigations were begun in his early days at Cambridge, and were continued throughout his life, as his pastoral duties in the quiet country parish of Thornhill left him ample leisure to pursue his favourite hobbies. Michell's publications include papers on geology, physics, and astronomy. His best-known geological paper is a thesis on earthquakes, but Sir A. Geikie shows that he made laborious and accurate observations on the strata of England, and that—without the assistance of any knowledge of fossils—he laid the foundations of English stratigraphy, at any rate so far as the Mesozoic beds are concerned. In physics, particularly in magnetism, Michell made many ingenious observations, and he was also a pioneer in astronomy, though the tradition that the great William Herschel (the discoverer of Uranus) received his first lessons from him appears to be untrue. Michell constructed much of his own apparatus, including a reflecting telescope which, after his death, was bought by Herschel for thirty pounds—a large sum in those days, of course. He seems to have paid fairly frequent visits to London, and it was during these journeys, usually very leisurely, that he made most of his remarkable observations on the geological strata. This interesting volume illustrates incidentally how favourable the conditions of the eighteenth century were, in many respects, to the cultivation of deep learning.

A Writer's Recollections, by Mrs. Humphry Ward (W. Collins & Sons). Mrs. Humphry Ward has written a book of serious gossip concerning people with whom she came in contact from the age of five onwards. The authoress describes how her father, Thomas Arnold, the second son of Arnold of Rugby, settled in New Zealand in 1847. In that country he married in 1850, and his eldest child—Mrs. Ward—was born in 1851. Shortly afterwards Thomas Arnold became a Roman Catholic, and such was the bigotry of the colony that he had to give up his appointment and return to England with his wife and children in 1856, when he settled down at Fox How in Westmoreland. Later he

moved to Oxford, and Mrs. Ward describes many of the Mid-Victorian worthies whom she came across during her early youth—Mark Pattison, John Richard Green, George Henry Lewis, Benjamin Jowett, and others. She describes the visit of M. Taine in 1872 and his grief on hearing of the devastation caused by the Commune in Paris. A good deal of space is given up to the description of long-forgotten Oxford controversies, which will be interesting to those who remember how keenly they were fought out and how important they seemed in the last century. Perhaps one of the most interesting chapters is that which describes a visit Mrs. Ward paid with her husband to Paris in 1874, when France was already determined to rebuild herself and to avenge her defeat. She met many interesting people, among them Madame Mold, who had lived through the fall of the *Ancien Régime*, the Terror, the war with Germany, and the Commune. Mrs. Ward also describes her first sight of Sarah Bernhardt, and how amused she was with her "Uncle Matt" when he remarked, "But, my dear child, you see, you never saw Rachel." Mrs. Ward gives an interesting account of an interview she had with the Empress Frederick in 1898. The Empress had read "*Helbeck of Bannisdale*" and wished to meet the authoress, who gives a pathetic account of that great and unhappy lady, and a hitherto unpublished anecdote of Bismarck with regard to her. Some delightful Italian visits are described during which Mrs. Ward made many friends, notably Henry James, the author. A good deal of the book is taken up with the description of the writing of "*Robert Elsmere*," a novel which caused some discussion in its day, and other works, all written with the care and pains for which Mrs. Ward is remarkable. The book is well got up and has some interesting photographs of the authoress and many of her friends.

Leo Tolstoy, by Aylmer Maude (Methuen & Co.). Mr. Maude has written a delightful Life of that eccentric genius, Leo Tolstoy, based upon the larger Life, in two volumes, which he published some years ago. Leo Tolstoy was born in 1828 at Bright Glade, about 130 miles south of Moscow. Mr. Maude gives a charming description of his friend's childhood and youth, spent with his beloved Auntie Tatiana and his elder brother Nicholas on his father's estate. In 1851 the Caucasus was in an unsettled condition, and Tolstoy accompanied his elder brother, an artillery officer, on an expedition against the hill tribes. Mr. Maude prints an entry from the young man's diary written during this campaign, which is interesting, as showing the bent of his mind even at that early age. In January, 1854, he became an officer in the Army and fought in the Crimean War. His letters to his Aunt on his adventures are strangely like those of our own young officers at the front. After his marriage in 1862 Leo Tolstoy settled down to a new life and began his first great novel, "*War and Peace*." "*Anna Karenina*" followed when the author was in his forty-fifth year. Mr. Maude describes the well-known views of the great socialist and reformer, and the extremely unsuccessful colonies which were started to carry out those views. In an interesting chapter he criticises with great justice and impartiality the doctrines put forward by Tolstoy. The extraordinary "*Kreutzer Sonata*" was begun in 1889. The book

interested many who could not agree with it, but it lost the author many friends. In his chapter on the Doukhobors, Mr. Maude explains the difficulties and misunderstandings which arose with the Canadian Government over the colony founded for those "peculiar people" by Tolstoy, and Prince Hilhov in that country. The last chapters are devoted to an account of the excommunication of Tolstoy, and of his illness and death. Mr. Maude is extremely fair in his description of the misunderstandings and differences which constantly arose between the great man and his wife, the unfortunate Countess Tolstoy. The countess had undertaken an immense amount of work for her husband, and had had the whole burden of the education and upbringing of the children on her hands. Tolstoy's strange ideas on the sex question and on the wickedness of owning property of any kind made her life a difficult one—all these difficulties were fostered by Tchertkof. Tolstoy left his wife and home in October, 1910, and died on 7 November of that year.

The Epistles of Erasmus, by Francis Morgan Nichols. (In three volumes. Vol. III. Longmans, Green & Co.) In the third volume of his translation of the Epistles of Erasmus, Mr. Nichols completed an enormous work which he began at the age of nearly 70, an age at which most men have finished their labours. The task of editing this volume has been undertaken by Mr. P. S. Allen, of Overton College, who has written a delightful introduction to the Epistles. These letters were written between August, 1517, and September, 1518 (when Erasmus was 50 years of age), by far the greater number of them from Louvain, others from Antwerp and Basle. The book is divided into fifteen chapters, continued from the second volume; the first (or thirty-ninth) chapter contains letters dealing chiefly with the grief of Erasmus and More over the death of Ammonius from the sweating sickness which was devastating London. In the 611th Epistle, Erasmus wishes More were safe with him in Louvain. The second chapter contains many letters to English friends, and Epistle 630 is a triumph of dignified and gentle reproof to James Lefèvre who had attacked him. In Epistle 634 are some verses written by More upon a double portrait of Erasmus and Peter Gillis painted by Quentin Matseys and sent by the friends to Sir Thomas. A good many letters in the forty-third chapter describe a controversy with "a bad Jew become a worse Christian" named Pfeffercorn; "that pestilent corn, that trumpeter of the Furies, that veritable vicar of Satan." The next chapter has an interesting letter on the prosperity of Rome under Leo X, and the following one consists largely of letters on the Hypostatic Union, a controversy with Lefèvre and others, and ends with an amusing letter from Berselius describing a visit to the Bishop of Huy. Next in order are letters in which he speaks of his work on the New Testament now nearing completion; and the chapter ends with a long letter from William Latimer. All the letters in the forty-eighth chapter are written from Antwerp: Mr. Nichols suggests that being unable to get at his books, Erasmus spent his spare time in attending to his correspondence. The chapter ends with a long letter to Budé on the Lefèvre controversy. In March, 1518, he speaks of preparations for a journey to Basle: "For the purpose of issuing an emended and more

complete edition of the New Testament, being apprehensive that this business will be badly managed if I am not on the spot myself." In the 758 Epistle he says : " Upon the New Testament again renewed my toil is finished," and speaks of his plans for the publication of his book. In the forty-ninth and fiftieth chapters Erasmus is still at Louvain, and the fifty-first is taken up with some letters written in the previous year, hitherto unpublished, beginning with a letter to Wolsey, followed by one to Ulrich von Hulten containing a most interesting account of Sir Thomas More. At last, in Epistle 801, Erasmus tells of his arrival in Basle on Ascension Day, 1518. In the 808 Epistle he describes his work on the New Testament to Antonio Pucci, Legati Apostolicæ in Switzerland ; the chapter ends with a letter of congratulation from Leo X. In the last chapter Erasmus is back in Louvain, though the 819th Epistle is dated from Antwerp. The volume ends with a short letter to Henry Glarean. These letters show a charming personality, affectionate to his friends, just to his enemies, full of learning and full of wit ; the book will be a joy to many who could not read the Epistles in the Latin. The translation is so good that it is almost impossible to remember that the language is not the original.

Thirty Years in Tropical Australia, by the Right Reverend Gilbert White, D.D., with a Preface by the Right Reverend H. H. Montgomery, D.D. (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge).

Bishop White was born in 1859, ordained priest in 1884, and left England for North Australia on account of his health in 1885. He became Bishop of Carpentaria in 1900, and fifteen years later Bishop of the new diocese of Wallochra in South Australia. The Bishop has written an entertaining and most instructive book, valuable as being the experiences of a man whose work has necessitated constant journeys, across the great tablelands—districts covered with "scrub," the scrub being composed of magnificent trees whose straight stems run up 100 feet or more without a branch. Although constituting a vast variety of valuable timber, this scrub is unfortunately becoming a thing of the past, and Bishop White suggests that reserves should be marked out in the still untouched areas, to be preserved for future generations, before it is too late. An interesting chapter is that on "An outpost of the Empire"—a group of islands lying about twenty miles from the extreme north of Australia, of which Thursday Island, though the smallest, is the most important. The township on Thursday Island is almost unique among Australasian towns, the population numbering about 700 whites, and about 1,300 persons of the most varied nationalities under the sun. Bishop White considers that some day this Island will be one of the most important and most strongly guarded of the outposts of the Empire.

Lieutenant K. O. Mackenzie, who has been a resident sheller in the Torres Strait for many years, contributes an extremely interesting chapter on Pearl Fishing in those waters, and on the bad results which would follow any hasty or ill-conceived handling of the pearl fishing industry. The book ends with an able chapter on "A White Australia." The Bishop has great sympathy with those who believe that Australia should be retained entirely for the white man, but says that this policy

has suffered not a little from its friends and defenders who have argued their case with such absurd arrogance and conceit that decent men are tempted to turn in disgust from the policy, because of its advocates. All the same, he believes that there is much to be said for a White Australia, and says it is not only from lower motives that it has been advocated. However, with regard to the empty North it will probably be necessary to allow coloured labour. The Australian birthrate is low, the people insist on living in the large towns, and have an inordinate love of pleasure; this being the case, there seems to be no prospect of the empty North becoming inhabited to any great extent by a white population during the next hundred years. This chapter should be read by all those who are interested in the future of Australia. The book has some excellent photographs and two small maps of the Northern Territory and Queensland respectively.

In the Alaskan Wilderness, by George Byron Gordon (The John C. Winston Company), is one of the most remarkable books of travel published during the year. The author is Director of the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, and is well known as one of the leading ethnologists of America. The expedition which is described in this volume was carried out as far back as 1907, and the author was accompanied during it by his brother, Lieutenant MacLaren Gordon, who has, unhappily, since fallen in France. The author and his brother were very practical explorers, and at Fairbanks, on the Tanana river, they built their own canoe, in which they travelled over 1,000 miles through the northern wilderness. The author states that the main object of the expedition was to find out what opportunities there might be for a study of the native tribes dwelling in the very sparsely populated region between the Yukon and Kuskokwim rivers. The author apparently contemplated making another expedition to the same region, but he seems to have abandoned this idea, possibly owing to the death of his brother, and he therefore gives his geographical and ethnographical results in this volume. The book is very well illustrated by sketches and photographs of the natives and of the country, and there are also some excellent maps. The book is also very interestingly written and the author is clearly an enthusiast for his subject.

The Megalithic Culture of Indonesia, by W. J. Perry, M.A. (Longmans, Green & Co.), is a book on a fascinating problem relating to late prehistoric times which will be of interest not only to the scientific anthropologist but to the general public. The recent developments of science and of ancient history tend to prove that in the earlier ages of the history of man, long voyages were undertaken to a far greater extent than used to be supposed. Columbus, Cabot, and the early Portuguese navigators who reached the East were by no means the first of their kind. The exploits of the early Scandinavian discoverers of America ("Vinland") are now well known, but recently strong evidence has been found that other races, Phœnicians and other Oriental peoples, made great voyages in far earlier times. There is good reason to believe that there was communication between civilised Asiatics and the west coast of America. The theory has been put forward by several authorities that the great stone monuments, known as megaliths, show such strange

similarities wherever they are found, that they must owe their origin to peoples sharing a common culture. Mr. Perry approaches this subject in an original and ingenious manner. He examines the culture of the primitive tribes of Indonesia, and finds, so he believes, that this culture is made up of diverse elements, joined into one. He believes that the megaliths and various features in the culture of Indonesia originated from alien immigrants, passing through the Asiatic archipelago, and that some of these migrants remained there and founded families, some of which survive to this day. The book and the theory around which it is written throw a flood of light upon the activities of man just before the dawn of history.

The Economic History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, by George O'Brien (Maunsell & Co.), is a work which, written by an avowed Nationalist, must be classed as a serious study of one aspect of Irish history in the century mentioned in the title. Moreover, the author does not display any very serious bias, and he certainly bases his conclusions on a careful consideration of facts, and we learn from the publishers that the book "is compiled entirely from original sources." The book is divided into five parts, dealing respectively with the people, the land, trade and industry, public finance, and political influences. The chapter on population is particularly interesting, and, like the rest of the book, is written in a careful and scholastic manner. The population of the island at the end of the seventeenth century was probably about 1,500,000. A reliable estimate by Mr. G. P. Bushe gave the figures 4,040,000 for the year 1788. And in 1813 the population was about 6,000,000. Mr. O'Brien comes to the general conclusion that Ireland advanced greatly in prosperity during the period of Grattan's Parliament, and that this was the direct result of the legislative liberty enjoyed. This opinion was combated by James Connolly, the Irish rebel of 1916, who naturally cannot be suspected of any sympathy with Unionism. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that Mr. O'Brien advances facts which do seem to prove that there was a marked improvement in economic conditions during the last quarter of the eighteenth century, whether or not this had any connexion with parliamentary independence. The rapid increase of population, the fact that raw wool entirely ceased to be exported, the great improvement in the cotton manufacture, and other similar phenomena cannot be ignored. Various other chapters in the book deal with absenteeism, famines, afforestation, the industrial revolution in Ireland, and other interesting and important topics. Mr. O'Brien's work will repay study, and it is undoubtedly a serious and erudite contribution to the study of Irish history.

Luxemburg and her Neighbours, by Ruth Putnam (Putnams & Sons), is a book which appeared opportunely, as it was obvious from the beginning of the war that the status of the Grand-Duchy would have to be considered at the Peace Conference which would end the state of war in Europe. The authoress is an American, who has made a close study of European affairs, and had previously published works on Charles the Bold of Burgundy, on Alsace and Lorraine, and on other historical subjects. The sub-title states that the book is "A record of the political

fortunes of the present Grand-Duchy from the eve of the French Revolution to the Great War, with a preliminary sketch of events from 963 to 1780." The book is accordingly divided into two parts, of which the first (and shorter) is the so-called "preliminary sketch." The existing Grand-Duchy is a much truncated representative of the historic Luxemburg, since not only was part of the territory given to Belgium, but fragments were also absorbed by France and Prussia respectively. The book has certain blemishes, but on the whole it is very good, and the authoress has clearly taken great pains to master the sources of information on her subject. The fortunes of Luxemburg during the French Revolutionary period are described in full, and the iniquities perpetrated there by Napoleon's orders are vividly told. The period of the French tyranny was probably the most unhappy time in the whole history of the territory, evidently much worse than any sufferings which may have occurred when the little country formed part of the Spanish Netherlands. The authoress holds that the affinity and sympathies of the people are more with Belgium than with Germany, and, indeed, the fact that Luxemburg was part of the German Confederation from 1815 to 1866 has little significance, since a part of Holland was also included originally in the Confederation. It is probable, however, that the part of Luxemburg which retained its independence after the final partition of 1839 was the most German and least Belgian part of the country. The history of the Duchy during the nineteenth century is told in great detail, and, for the most part, quite accurately. The book has, however, as already stated, certain blemishes; and of these the most annoying is an extraordinary inaccuracy in expressing figures. In several places we are told that the area of the Grand-Duchy is 199 square miles—this even occurs on the principal map. The figure should be 999. Again, we find the astounding piece of information that after 1866 Prussia added "forty-one and one-half millions to her population." This is probably only careless proof-reading—but it is certainly extremely careless. The description of the position of Schleswig and Holstein is also somewhat misleading. On the whole, however, the book is very valuable. There are excellent notes appended to the history, and there is a very full bibliography. The volume is well illustrated and is provided with a number of maps.

The League of Nations: An Historical Argument, by A. F. Pollard (Milford), is a booklet which deserves attention by reason of the transcendent importance of the topic and the author's eminence as an historian. Much was written on the subject of a League of Nations during 1918, but Professor Pollard's contribution to the discussion is certainly one of the most arresting. The book has three chapters entitled respectively, "The Conditions of the Problem," "The League of Nations on Paper," and "The Lesson of History." The value of the first chapter resides in the fact that it does not try to evade the criticisms which have been directed against the contemporary movement for a League of Nations. The criticism that at the end of every great war there has been a strong sentiment in favour of peace, but that this sentiment has been uniformly ephemeral, is undoubtedly valid. But Professor Pollard points out that conditions have been altering, and that the triumphs of mechanical science in particular, which have annihilated

distance, have made a world-society not only more possible but much more necessary. There is no fact in contemporary politics more important to emphasise than this. Professor Pollard, however, would proceed slowly, and he shows that if we are content to limit our speed, the "paper" difficulties need not trouble us. He says that "the first step towards permanent peace is not therefore the erection of a tribunal or the establishment of a super-state. It is a simple treaty between as many Powers as possible not to make war upon one another without previous recourse to other means, and to resist with all their forces any similar breach of the peace on the part of others." The author points out in considerable detail that to proceed in this manner would be analogous to the process by which Henry II. suppressed private war among his barons. The noble who made war without first having recourse to law brought down upon himself the superior power of the overlord—an English State hardly existed at that time. And this eventually proved an effective deterrent.

Collected Poems of Rupert Brooke, with a Memoir (Sidgwick & Jackson). Mr. Marsh has written a charming and sympathetic memoir of Rupert Brooke, allowing the poet to tell the story of his life himself, to a great extent, in his own inimitable letters. The book shows the extraordinary charm of the young poet, a charm felt not only by brother poets and intellectuals, but by all those with whom he came in contact, from Philistine schoolboys to his beloved Fegians. Probably one secret of his attraction was the fact that he found charm in the most unlikely places. "I can watch a dirty, middle-aged tradesman in a railway carriage for hours, and love every dirty button on his spotted unclean waistcoat," he says in a letter written in 1900. "The good mystic knows how jolly good is," he says in the same letter, and this sentence perhaps sums up his outlook on life. In September, 1914, he took a commission and was with the Naval Brigade at Antwerp. In 1911 he had written, "I have sampled and sought out German culture. It has changed all my political views; I am wildly in favour of nineteen new dreadnoughts. German culture must never prevail! The Germans are nice and well-meaning, and they try, but they are 'soft.'" In his letters from Antwerp he tells of the severity of the Germans. These letters are extraordinarily interesting.

In February, 1915, he was with the Naval Division in the expedition to the Dardanelles. The story of the death and burial of this brilliant son of England at Scyros on Friday, April 23, the day of England's Saint and England's Poet, is told in a letter from a friend who was with him when he died.

There is little that is new among the poems here published. The poem entitled "1914" was widely read, and the sonnets three and five have been an inspiration and comfort to numberless Englishmen and English women. They are strangely prophetic of the author's own brilliant life and death.

The lasting impression the poems leave is that of youth—the joy, the pathos, the impatience and the merriment of youth. Nothing comes amiss to his muse; he is equally at home in the exquisite sonnet, "The Hill," and in the extreme realism of "The Channel Passage."

Mr. Marsh has collected in an appendix some fragments found in a notebook used by Rupert Brooke during the last month of his life, together with a few other songs and poems.

A Poet's Pilgrimage, by W. H. Davies (Melrose). This is a book about a walk which the author took from Carmarthen through South Wales. Mr. Davies starts his tour "full of joy at the thought of going on and on, the uncertainty of where I would get my next meal, what kind of people I would meet, and where I would sleep that night," and it was in this spirit the pilgrimage was made. His first day's walk was one of fifteen miles to Llanelly; he then goes through Swansea, Neath, Merthyn, Abergavenny, Monmouth, Tintern, Chepstow, Newport, and Cardiff, and thus encounters various kinds of scenery, including mountainous, pastoral, and colliery. He refreshes himself with various glasses of ale at the wayside inns, and encounters all sorts and conditions of men there; he is always ready to be friendly, and he is often the recipient of private troubles. The tramps on the road he is particularly kind to, and he had several amusing experiences with them. Children, too, come in for his bounty, and he scatters his pennies very liberally. Mr. Davies has a great deal to say about the characteristics of the Welsh; how the stranger is suspect; how they hate walking; how the well-to-do are content to live in miserable-looking little houses, and of the enmity which sometimes exists between the people of towns adjoining each other. He also has many excellent stories to tell about the people he meets—the concertina man who boasts of his abilities, and how differently he would play if he could get gold for his reward instead of pennies, or of the rag and bone man "who had been very prosperous in his day," and of the man who had exclaimed in the inn, "Aristotle was Plato's pupil," and would have been violently attacked for being a "bad minded villain," but for the fact that he was a stranger in the town; and of many others too numerous to mention. At Cardiff Mr. Davies takes train to Bristol, and has a most exciting adventure in the dark Severn tunnel. From Chippenham he walks through Marlborough, Newbury, and Reading to Maidenhead. At Marlborough he encounters the scratching tramp of whom he tells a most delightful story, and the tour ends at Maidenhead where he sleeps at a common lodging-house. Mr. Davies has given an account of his walk in his own inimitable naïve manner. He sees everything, sordidness as well as beauty, and he so describes the people and the things which he sees that we are enabled to see, too, with his eyes.

Paris Through an Attic, by A. Herbage Edwards (J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd.), is a delightful record of how two young married people with "seventy pounds a year this year and next" managed to live in Paris for those two years, and how they solved the problem of how "to live at all after." They find an ideal flat in Paris for 13*l.* a year, and furnish it for 10*l.*, and then follows a charming description of the daily routine of their lives in their new home. The author says that during this time "I learnt very exhaustively the lesson that leisure doesn't descend from on high a free gift, but has to be paid for always, paid for by someone somehow. . . . As I paid for it myself, and only got it when paid for, I could

make no mistake about the matter." They take all the advantages that the Sorbonne offers, and duly entered themselves as students and paid their 30 francs. "We were now free of the University, its library, and its lectures. It only remained for us to choose our own from among so many." Miss Edwards then gives a most interesting account of the Professors of the Sorbonne, their subjects of discourse, and their mannerisms. She next tells of the joys of Sundays and holidays in Paris; sometimes spent at the Louvre or wandering up and down the quays, the booksellers' row of Paris, or in wandering over Paris as far as the docks of the Bassin de la Villette where are seen the loaded barges of the canals. The visit to the Halles was a morning of pure delight, for, says the author, "the fill of joy and beauty was here." They go to hear the music of the churches, the theatre too is afforded, the Grand Prix is attended, Versailles and other notable places are visited. As time goes on they are asked out to parties and many most interesting people are met; and the author has much to say on the fact that "the whole pivot of French family life is the tie between parents and children, not that between husband and wife." The struggle to live on 70*l.* a year is nearing its close, and after a day of intense suspense and difficulty they hear that "Richard was Docteur de l'Université de Paris, and in his little corner of philology he had already made a name. The race was out."

Miss Herbage Edwards has made a perfectly charming book of her experiences in Paris, and the work is packed with information and is full of original ideas given in a lucid and thoughtful way. She loves her Paris that is clear, and understands the people. France for her is "a land to live for, and a land to die for, a land to know and love."

Three French Moralists, by Edmund Gosse, C.B. (Heinemann). Mr. Gosse tells us in his introduction that "the object of these essays is to trace back to its source the spirit of gallantry which inspired the young French officers at the beginning of the war." The first three essays deal with the three French Moralists, La Rochefoucauld, La Bruyère, and Vauvenargues, and Mr. Gosse says that he has made his choice of these three because they "stand out among the other moralists of France by the adoption of the maxim as their mode of instruction."

The Duke of La Rochefoucauld was born on September 15, 1613, and the family was one of the most noble in Europe. The "Maximes" was first published anonymously in 1665, but later the author became known. "The Maxims were atoms of gold sifted through the mesh of discussions at the dinner-table, around the fire in winter . . . in endless talk between two or more trained and intelligent persons . . . until at last the company dispersed, leaving La Rochefoucauld to capture and to fix the essential result of all that desultory conversation."

La Bruyère was twenty when the "Maximes" was published, and Mr. Gosse thinks that it is impossible to doubt that the example of the "Maximes" had a great deal to do with the form of the "Caractères." The "Caractères" was finished in 1687. The author was the type of the plebeian citizen of Paris, and he is in marked contrast with the aristocratic La Rochefoucauld. Mr. Gosse describes the *Caractères* "as one of the most readable books in all literature."

The Marquis de Vauvenargues "was not merely the greatest moralist that France produced in the course of the eighteenth century, but was of all the world's writers perhaps the one who has lifted highest the banner of hope and joy in heroism and virtue." The Marquis de Vauvenargues belonged to the class of *petite noblesse* and was born in 1715. The "Conseils à un Jeune Homme" was finished in 1743, and it is owing to Voltaire that he ever became an author.

Mr. Gosse has given a finished and instructive piece of work on the three Moralists of his choice, and his last essay, "The Gallantry of France," is a fitting conclusion to the book, showing so forcibly that "there is no other country than France where the maker of maxims has stamped a deep and permanent impression upon the conscience and the moral habits of the nation."

Industrial Justice Through Banking Reform, by Henry Meulen (R. J. James), is an extremely original and heterodox contribution to economics. It is described in the sub-title as "An outline of a policy of individualism," but the policy proposed by the author bears little resemblance to the ordinary doctrines of anti-socialism. The author would banish the accepted gold standard basis of the English currency, and he would introduce far-reaching reforms into the system of credit to which we in England have been accustomed. He believes that the gold standard is an unnecessary inheritance from barbarism and is, in essence, a disguised variant of the primitive system of barter. The titles of some of the more important chapters will give an idea of the scope of the book. Chapter I. is called "Socialism and Anti-Socialism." Chapter II. is a philosophic review of economic progress. Chapter IV. is entitled "The Principles of Exchange." Chapter VI. deals with the Bank of England. Chapter VIII. is styled "A Review of Scotch Banking." Chapter X. deals with the international adoption of a gold currency. Chapter XII. is entitled an invariable unit of value, and Chapter XIV. answers standard objections to the author's theories. Probably the most interesting chapter in the book is that on Scotch banking, for it is here that we see in actual practice an advance towards the system of which the author approves. He believes that banks should be given much wider powers to issue banknotes, and he thinks it desirable that the population should be able to obtain much greater credit from banks. He thinks that the troubles of labour are due to the concentration of capital in a few hands. He shows that in Scotland in the past, poor, but able, trustworthy and promising young men were able to obtain credit from bankers at a low rate of interest; and since these bankers were well acquainted with the people in their own localities, they were as a rule well able to judge to whom it was wise and to whom it was unwise to give credit in this manner. In this way competent persons were often able to rise from the labouring to the property-owning class. It is a modification of this system which the author advocates. There is much which is convincing in the argument based upon the old Scottish system, and the author's plea that it was more natural and superior to our own, is undoubtedly deserving of the closest attention. One cannot help feeling, however, that the circumstances of the Scottish banks and their clients were somewhat exceptional, and particularly favourable to the

system then developed. In our own day when means of communication have so largely destroyed the limited, but concentrated, local life which existed in the past, bankers would not have the same opportunity of intimately judging character in the manner which they used to do in Scotland. The author's argument is, however, very ingenious and shows quite exceptional originality.

Trivia, by Logan Pearsall Smith (Constable). "These pieces of moral prose" treat of almost every subject, and Mr. Pearsall Smith's idea on these subjects are quite different from anyone else's, and he expresses them quite differently too. In one of these pieces he says: "I should be all right. . . . If it weren't for these sudden visitations of Happiness, these downpourings of Heaven's blue, little invasions of Paradise, or waftings to the Happy Islands, or whatever you call these disconcerting Moments, I should be like everybody else, and as blameless a ratepayer as any in our Row." It is quite true Mr. Pearsall Smith is filled with the joy of life, and he sees comedy in everything. He laments his lost youth, but he even finds consolation for that. "The other day, depressed on the Underground, I tried to cheer myself by thinking over the joys of our human lot. But there wasn't one of them for which I seemed to care a button—not Wine, nor Friendship, nor Eating, nor Making Love, nor the Consciousness of Virtue. Was it worth while then going up in a lift into a world that had nothing less trite to offer?"

"Then I thought of reading—the nice and subtle happiness of reading. This was enough, this joy not dulled by Age, this polite and unpunished vice, this selfish, serene, life-long intoxication." The author has his adventures and his daring ideas, but he ends as an ordinary man "under an umbrella."

Remnants, by Desmond MacCarthy (Constable). Mr. MacCarthy has given in this book "Remnants" a series of sketches on a diversity of people and of things. Whether he is writing about Dan Leno, Lord George Sanger, Ethel Levey or Samuel Butler, Meredith or Voltaire, each character is treated with a freshness and originality peculiar to the writer. "A Hermit's Day" is particularly fine, and the picture given of the insolent, aged, fiery Voltaire who so truly lives up to his maxim that "he only half lives who half thinks. The consolation of life is to say what one thinks," is most fascinating. "Two Historic Houses" presents a fine contrast between two forceful characters. The few fantasies of his own too are filled with delicate wit and good writing. The book is delightful for its subject matter, its charm, and its style.

III. FICTION.

Five Tales, by John Galsworthy (Heinemann). These five tales are all of high quality. "The Juryman," "A Stoic," and "The Indian Summer of a Forsyte," contain many moving and exquisite things and many diverse characters, from the masterful old director to the pitiable, dejected would-be suicide. In "The Juryman" the vulgar type of Briton is ably portrayed in the jurymen with their dull outlook on life and their utter lack of human charity; they are called to give a verdict on a would-be "suicide in Khaki." The pathetic and stirring

speech of the nerveless pitiable prisoner from the dock in defence of his act stirs one of the jurymen, a Mr. Bosengate of the Stock Exchange. His troubled musings lead him to feel that "life's a wonderful thing, one can't live all to oneself . . . understanding—sympathy, it's priceless." The scene with his wife did not come off as he had planned it, and he exclaims: "There's something ironical which walks about, things don't come off as you think they will. Fact is, life's too big a thing for one. All the same, I'm not the man I was yesterday—not quite." The "Indian Summer of a Forsyte" gives an exquisite picture of an old man's new joy in life on meeting a sympathetic and charming companion. Uncle Jolyon and Irene are re-introduced from "The Man of Property." He had not seen Irene for three years, even before her unfortunate affair with young Bosinney, and when he came upon her unawares in the grounds of his home at Robin Hill—where she had gone for memory's sake—he felt a great awakening of joy and happiness. The rest of his people are away, and then follow days of deep peace and joy for Jolyon and Irene. He is taxing his strength, he is convinced; his happiness with Irene is so great. "Something beat within him in these days that with each throb fretted at the thinning shell . . . he knew he could not stop that beating, nor would if he could." When at last this happiness is likely to be taken from him we are given an ending of unforgettable beauty. In "A Stoic," Sylvanus Heythorp, the old stoic of eighty, by mere force of character, and in spite of his physical disabilities is able to dominate everything and everybody that he comes in contact with. It is mid-Victorian in time and manners and the masterful old director, when he finds himself at the mercy of his enemy, goes down in the only way that such a character could. The scene of his last dinner and death is wonderful in its strength and descriptive power. There are other characters which help to enrich the story: Mrs. Larne, Bob Pillin, and Ventnor, the vulgar solicitor. "The Apple Tree" is a touching tale of youthful love frustrated by the class prudence of Ashurst. Megan's end is told with touching simplicity by the old labourer. There is a fine description of Dartmoor scenery. Ashurst and his wife are motoring in the district, and just happen on a certain spot which sets Ashurst thinking of the events of twenty-six years ago. And this retrospection gives a great impression of beauty. "The First and the Last" is an excellent tale of the fine feelings of a ne'er-do-well in contrast to the blunt and coarsened feelings of the successful brother.

Conrad in Quest of his Youth, by Leonard Merrick, with an introduction by J. M. Barrie (Hodder & Stoughton). This is the first volume of a whole new edition of Leonard Merrick's works, and in his introduction Sir James Barrie says that Mr. Merrick has long been the "novelist's novelist," and that he is "one of the flowers of their calling." "Conrad in Quest of his Youth," Sir James affirms, is one of the choicest things in our latter-day literature.

When Conrad was thirty-seven his aunt died and left him everything. Liberated by "everything," and deciding that he is old, Conrad makes up his mind to go in search of the Past. His first journey takes him to Paris, "the ardour of the students left him chilly," and he suffers disillusionment. He next decides on a trip to Sweetbay, in memory of his

bucket and spade days, where he had spent a summer with his three cousins. He invites the three to share his enthusiasm, but the whole adventure ends in a dismal failure and the cousins hurriedly return to London. Conrad determines not to give in; there was a Mary Page of these days for whom he was "sick with romance," and after weeks of inquiries he finds her at Tooting. She is Mrs. Barchester-Bailey now, and after a few minutes in her house he was glad to escape with a resolve that never, never did he want to see her again, but he had a reward for his troubles in the fact that "she thought he admired her very much." The next episode is brought about through a lady, who was sitting in the stall next to him at the theatre, taking out her handkerchief scented with chypre. Conrad is at once transported to Rouen of twenty years ago where he met the youthful and sympathetic Mrs. Adaile—she had always used chypre. She had been very kind to the boy of seventeen, and his memory of that last night's kiss awakens all the old boyish longing to see her again. After infinite trouble he at last finds Mrs. Adaile at an hotel in Ostend, and at their first meeting through her smile "for an instant the spirit of his youth flashed so close that he nearly captured it." This episode ends as the others have done, and Mrs. Adaile's farewell to the man of thirty-seven, incredible as his behaviour appears on that last night, is true; "*Dreamer!* Good-bye. There is no way back to Rouen." The last adventure is at Blithpoint, where he acts with great charm and good feeling the part of good angel to a party of strolling players who had been cheated by a rascally manager. These chapters are full of delight and pathos. And at last it was no companion of his childhood that brought back all the old zest of his youth to Conrad; whilst he is waiting for her "he realised that fizzing in his pulses and his mind was the zest, the buoyancy that he had mourned as dead . . . he had made his great discovery—that a man is young as often as he falls in love."

"Conrad in Quest of his Youth" is all that Sir James Barrie says of it.

Foe-Farrell, by "Q" (Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch), (Collins). Sir Arthur has given this story in the form of an allegory. It is a vivid drama in which hate and revenge have full play. Foe and Farrell are two men with distinct individualities, but in their blind pursuit of revenge one upon the other they constantly exchange personalities according to their mood of the moment, whether it is absorbed by hatred or momentarily released from it. The story is also a representation of the emotions produced by the Great War, and the moral of it is given at the end by the man who tells the story. He says: "As I see it, the more you beat Fritz by becoming like him, the more he has won. You may ride through his gates under an Arch of Triumph; but if he or his ghost sits on your saddle-bow, what's the use? You have demeaned yourself to him; you cannot shake him off, for his claws hook in you, and through the farther gate of Judgment you ride on inseparables condemned."

The story is told by Otway in a dug-out in France. John Foe is a Professor of Animal Morphology in the South London University College, and has devoted eight years of his life to the study of the characters of animals. Peter Farrell is a furniture dealer in Tottenham Court Road, and a candidate for the London County Council in the constituency where Foe's laboratory is situated. He is a vulgar, illiterate man, and in one of

his speeches denounces Foe as a vivisectionist. This speech and a letter of his to *The Times* incite the mob to wreck the laboratories; they burn all Foe's records—eight years' close work—and kill his dog. After this a relentless hate takes possession of Foe, and he determines to carry on his experiments and "test upon a fellow-man." He says, "with the brute beasts it was all observation, much of it uncertain. Henceforth it will be clean experiment. Farrell accused me of practising vivisection. As a matter of fact, I never did. Now I'm going to, and on Farrell." The chase begins; and in their life of intimacy Foe loses much of his superiority, and although Farrell is completely dominated by him and imitates him he becomes conscious of his growing strength, and is able to give his pursuer the slip for a year. When Foe again finds Farrell, he is married to a woman whom he met at San Ramon on the coast of Peru. They love each other devotedly, and her love had given Farrell a new outlook on life and a new strength and it is now Farrell who hates Foe. The three of them leave San Ramon, and during their voyage the ship is wrecked, and Santa, who is loved by both the men, dies of thirst. Foe and Farrell come to an island, and the only living thing to be found on it is a dog—exactly like the dog killed in Foe's laboratory—which attaches itself to Farrell. Foe's hatred begins to fade, but he becomes so debased that he deserts Farrell on the island. Farrell then turns pursuer and turns up unexpectedly some weeks later and succeeds in estranging the affections of Foe's fiancée. Finally, Foe in desperation murders Farrell and his dog. In a letter, where he gives a full account of the deed, he says: "As I knelt, the body of Farrell came floating down-stream . . . and I stared down on it . . . and I swear to God it was not Farrell's face but my own that I stared into." He then puts an end to himself to escape the effects of the dog's bite.

A subtle and wonderful book. The description of the shipwreck is a beautiful thing.

Mr. Cushing and Mlle. du Chastel, by Frances Ramsey (John Lane). This is the story of the marriage of Mr. Cushing, an American, to the French girl, Anne-Marie du Chastel. Mlle. du Chastel was the protégée of Miss Morrow, an American lady living in Paris, and it was at Miss Morrow's house that Cushing met his bride. At the age of ten Anne-Marie was left an orphan, and when she heard that Miss Morrow was planning to adopt her, the child of ten said, "*Mademoiselle*, the circumstances in which I find myself of course make it impossible for me to refuse so great a kindness. I thank you with all my heart. I hope that I may satisfy you." Anne-Marie does not lose her French characteristics by living with an American, and on her marriage at the age of twenty-three her thoughts, her expressions, and actions were as truly French as if she had never been with foreigners. After the honeymoon they go to America to make their home. They are seemingly very happy, but Anne-Marie does not appear to show any assimilation of Cushing's tastes and habits; there are differences between them, and she bitterly complains that he will not really let her into his life. Cushing, however, is brilliantly happy. Anne-Marie's cousin Mimi throws out suggestions, and Anne-Marie becomes suspicious of an innocent friendship between a Mrs. Herring and Cushing. Later she accuses him of unfaithfulness and

leaves him. She becomes very friendly with Arthur Irish and they finally go to England and live together, and Cushing divorces her. This mode of life goes on for a time, but she finally leaves Irish and all the luxuries and beautiful things that he has lavished on her, and goes back to live alone in Paris in a very simple way on her own small income. Cushing sees her there for the first time since their separation, and in a very clever scene he makes his proposal, and hesitating, Anne-Marie at last exclaims, "But how could I ever have believed, from the first, that any other ending was possible? That terrible America! It has ruined my sense of expediency!"

This novel is a brilliant achievement. The characters of Anne-Marie and Cushing, each so thoroughly typical of their own race, are drawn with extraordinary insight and skill. The story, too, is most cleverly told.

Gudrid the Fair, by Maurice Hewlett (Constable). In his preface Mr. Hewlett tells us that this tale is founded upon two sagas, and that he has blent the two accounts into one, and he says: "While I have been scrupulous in leaving the related facts as I found them, I have not hesitated to dwell upon the humanity in the tales, and to develop that as seemed fitting." Gudrid the Fair is the beautiful daughter of Thorbeorn the Iclander, who is getting old, and who is much averse to her being courted by the young men round about. For this reason he takes the motherless girl to Erne Pillar, which is below Snaefellness, and near the sea, to his good friend Orme and his wife Haldis. Gudrid is exceedingly happy with this kind couple, and one day meets at their house Einar the sailor, who tells her of his wonderful voyages to new lands beyond Iceland. He asks her to marry him, but her old father is obdurate, and Einar is sent away and Gudrid returns home to her father. Thorbeorn then resolves to leave Iceland, and sets sail for Greenland accompanied by Gudrid. They arrived and were made welcome at Brattalith, the house of Eric the Red. Shortly afterwards Gudrid marries Thore Easterling. Thorberg, the Wise Woman, had predicted that Gudrid was to have three husbands here in Greenland, and that she would not go far to get them. Thore does not live very long, and Gudrid marries Thorstan whom she had always loved. They set out on a voyage to Wineland the Good to bring back the body of Thorwald, who had been buried there on the last voyage of the party to that place. They encounter untold difficulties and are obliged to land at Lucefrith in West Greenland, and Thorstan Black receives them into his household. Gudrid has the harrowing experience of seeing almost the whole household one by one succumb to the winter sickness. Thorstan dies of it and Gudrid returns to Greenland. The Wise Woman's prophecy comes true, and Gudrid marries a third time—a man named Karlsefne, and soon after the marriage Karlsefne gets ready a well-equipped and large expedition and they set off for the Wineland and go up the Hudson river. Freydis and her husband joined the party too. They have many exciting adventures, but most of them return safely. Karlsefne and Gudrid with their numerous family return to Iceland and settle down there. Mr. Hewlett has made this classic into a beautiful story, and because he thinks that the sagas in their frugality and naked strength are unapproachable he has humanised them, and while paying

due respect to the explorations of America, "he has made his tale essentially upon the explorers of it."

Gudrid is a most lovable creature, and her three husbands worthy men. Freydis, with her dark moods and strength of character, has much in her to be admired. The description of the Greenland winter sickness was a poignant thing.

Mrs. Bente, by C. E. Lawrence (Collins). Mrs. Bente is the story of an idealist's effort to save a fellow-creature's soul, and the havoc which was wrought in many people's lives by the experiment. The story opens at St. Brendan's Clergy House by the Docks. Gervase Bente, the junior curate, "impulsive, unselfish, and extraordinarily inexperienced," is there with the vicar and Arthur Jerome the other curate. The vicar suspects Gervase of working too hard as he is so frequently out; but an anonymous letter which the vicar receives explains the matter and much distresses him. That same evening Gervase confesses to the vicar that he has pledged himself to undertake the task of saving the soul of a girl. "This girl is a sister of Mary Magdalen," he said, "I have seen her frequently; and have every reason and satisfaction to know that she is repentant and striving to live virtuously." Miss Poppy Parker is the girl on whom Gervase Bente is lavishing his pity and his help. She is a very clever, unscrupulous person and plays her part well. On one occasion when she hears his knock at the door she says: "I wonder if that is the fool. No, I'm not up to it to-day. It will do him good not to find me at home. It'll make him keener for—for my immortal soul." Things go on smoothly for a time, and Gervase in spite of many set-backs perseveres with his task. Poppy Parker one day visits St. Brendan's Church, and she encounters the vicar and Arthur Jerome as well as Gervase. There was a scene; "fiction and fact were inextricably interwoven in everything she said," and although she is able to hoodwink Gervase, Arthur Jerome is able to appraise her character: "She was born to make mischief," he said. "I've no doubt now of the existence of an active spirit of evil. . . . There is one other thing about her of which I have no shadow of doubt whatever. She's made up her mind to marry Gervase." Gervase was aghast at Jerome's declaration, but it proved to be true. They are married, and from that day Gervase knows no peace. Ellen Bente proves to be all that Jerome predicts about her, and she indulges in every form of wickedness and devilry, insults her husband's friends, disgraces his calling, heaps indignity upon indignity upon him, and so goads him that he at last plans to kill her. He is mercifully saved this last degradation, and he finds a note instead of his wife on his arrival home. In the note, after telling him that she is going abroad and that he can divorce her, she goes on to say: "By the way, you may be interested to know that my father was not a Colonel in any army, and his name was not Parker. He was an underpaid curate with too large a family. That's why I came to earn my living—in my own way—and why you found me such an eager Churchwoman.

"In spite of your beastliness lately, I don't hate you. I can't do more than despise you. I must go. If I stayed with you I should be sure to drive you mad. So good-bye.

"Ellen.

"P.S.—Even that is not my real name. What liars we all are!"

Mr. Lawrence has created in Ellen Bente a creature of rare evil and malevolence. It is a masterly character study. The other characters in the book, too, are finely done and help to make a book of rare excellence.

Karen, by Mrs. Alfred Sidgwick (Collins), is the story of a young English society girl—Karen—who just before the Great War had married a German officer. It gives a vivid account of her life in her husband's home before and during the war; of the German attitude towards the English prisoners: and there is a thrilling account of Karen's escape across the frontier hotly pursued by the enraged ex-tutor Herr Putzer because she had assisted some English prisoners to escape from camp. All ends well for her, and we leave her working contentedly in London for the soldiers and just about to marry again.

The story is told with strong conviction; and the fervid indictment against German methods of educating their youth is most convincing. The mentality of the German mind is cleverly illustrated in several instances.

The Laws of Chance, by F. E. Mills Young (John Lane). David Curtis, a man approaching the age of thirty, has resolved to leave London and try his fortune in South Africa. On the outward journey he meets a lady with whom he falls desperately in love, but who refuses to marry him. After a brief stay in Cape Town he goes to Kimberley where he becomes acquainted with a man—an Australian—who bargains to share 20,000*l.* with him if he will go to England to get jewels which are hidden in a safe there. Curtis at last acquiesces, and the key with directions carefully tied into a small stout leather bag are given over to him. The morning after this transaction Curtis hears of the murder of the Australian. He is then suspected by a certain gang of men of being in possession of the bag, and his adventures on this account form the most interesting chapter of the book. The picture of the life on the lonely farm in the Karroo is a very clear and picturesque one and much the best part of the book. The little bag with its secret comes to an inglorious end, and Curtis marries the girl he loved whom he again meets on the homeward journey.

The Fire of Green Boughs, by Mrs. Victor Rickard (Duckworth). The story is laid during the Great War, and centres round the life of a young society girl—Sylvia Tracy—who tries unsuccessfully to make herself useful by doing war-work. After her first attempt fails she goes to Ireland and there she gets into a scrape through succouring a dying German naval officer. She is rescued from the hands of the law by Willie Kent, who brings her back to London and to her cousin Dominie Roydon. Roydon has been lamed by the war, and after being ordained has become a fashionable and popular preacher, and through his influence Sylvia is received into the home of a fashionable society woman and acts as her private secretary. She is popular at first, but later Adrianna finds her in the way, and so she ingeniously arranges a scene at one of her dinner parties in which Sylvia's escapade with the dying German is so told that Society is shocked. Once more Sylvia Tracy becomes a vagabond, but this time Willie Kent rescues her for all time. There is a very sad episode of the young wounded officer who shoots himself because of the hopelessness of seeing the world any better after all the fine sacrifices of youth,

The story hangs very loosely together, and by far the best part of the book deals with the Irish people and description of Irish scenery.

The Sheepfold, by Laurence Housman (Duckworth), is the story of the life of a religious enthusiast—Jane Sterling—who was brought up amongst the Primitive Brethren. The dreariness of their religion surprised her, but “before long, however, her feeling for beauty and an instinctive attraction toward all things animate and bright became the medium through which her faith emerged from chrysalis form.” Jane was a very attractive girl, and at the age of fifteen was brutally seduced by a young man of the village, whom in a frenzy she one day kills because he will not leave her alone. Jane is forced by her mother to leave home, and her child is born in an institution where he was taken care of after Jane left. She goes through many hardships, but in her girlhood and “ever after in life when she was upon her beam ends—from a worldly point of view—her heart went up and sang.” Jane marries and is extremely happy for three years; and then occur a series of terrible misfortunes heaped one on top of the other, until it seems that Jane will never be able to pull through. Her husband and child both die under peculiarly sad circumstances, and after dedicating the best years of her life, amongst miserable and squalid surroundings, to the search for her illegitimate son, shortly after she has found him he is killed in a tavern brawl in New York harbour. All these griefs hurt her for a time, but she soon recovers, and goes for a seven years’ pilgrimage to America as a man. And then her mission begins; “and if the spirit of the Lord had truly descended upon Jane, a spirit of eager credulity had also descended upon the congregations which came to listen to her.” She taught them a new religion which “sounded the voice of joy,” and she taught them to laugh. She founded a communist society which, when it had a habitat of its own, became known as “The Jokers,” and Jane was called the Mother of the “Jokers.” Her struggles to keep her little community together were heroic; for the Church and the Trade were two great interests that were up against her. Jane succeeds, and although failure often stares her in the face she always pulls through, and the long tramp of the “Jokers” from one end of England to another to find a new abode when they had been turned out of their old one, is a fine instance of the strength of an indomitable spirit. Jane’s utterances are wise and full of fervour, and in one of her sermons she points to a field of corn near which they are all standing: “There’s a wonderful bit of worship for you!” she went on. “Which of us has worshipped God like yon fields of corn? There’s uprightness for you, there’s looking towards the light, there’s patience, there’s meekness, there’s a holding up of heads and a will to do His word, and a good and a joyful dwelling together of brethren in unity!” Jane keeps her flock together for many years, but not one of them has Jane’s enthusiasm and power, and because her way of salvation is an easy one she gradually loses all her flock, and in the end she is left living alone in the communal barn. Mr. Housman has made a stirring, buoyant character of Jane Sterling. He makes her suffer almost too deeply, but she comes through every ordeal with added strength and a will to do good. “The Sheepfold” is a great work.

The Return of the Soldier, by Rebecca West (Nisbet). This is a

very unusual story. The opening scene is at Baldry Court, the luxurious home of Chris Baldry and his wife Kitty. Kitty is a soulless butterfly, and Jenny, Chris's devoted cousin, lives with them. Chris, who is at the front, has not been heard of for some weeks, and just as Jenny is beginning to worry about this fact a visitor appears at Baldry Court. She is a Mrs. Grey, and Chris has written to her after a lapse of fifteen years calling her by her Christian name—Margaret Allington. She is now an unprepossessing, middle-aged woman, "repulsively furred with neglect and poverty." Her story of the letter and telegram is not at first believed, but when she cries out pleadingly, "He's lost his memory, and thinks—thinks he still knows me," Jenny is convinced. The story is true, Chris Baldry is suffering from shell-shock and has lost all memory of the past fifteen years. He returns home, but has utterly forgotten Kitty and his marriage. Kitty arranges that he shall see Margaret Allington at Baldry Court, and the evening before she comes Chris tells Jenny his love story. "She is charity and love itself," Chris tells Jenny. "She is a little near-sighted; you can't imagine how sweet it makes her look;" and so he goes over the days spent with Margaret fifteen years ago at her father's house, the Monkey Island Inn. Jenny hears the end of the love story from Margaret herself, how through a series of trivial accidents it all came to an end. Chris and Margaret meet, and Chris takes up his love for Margaret where it left off fifteen years ago, and the passages of the book where this development is described are very fine indeed. Jenny becomes much impressed by Margaret's character, and feels, "that the deep inter-thing that had guided Chris to forgetfulness had guided her to poverty, so that when the time came for her meeting with her lover there should be not one intimation of the beauty of suave flesh to distract him from the message of her soul." Then a physician appears, and it is Margaret who decides to sacrifice her happiness, and the experiment is made of trying to cure Chris of his hallucination by reminding him of his dead child. The experiment is successful. Chris is cured, and looks once more "Every inch a soldier." Miss West has made of Margaret a character of unusual charm and unselfconsciousness; the bare fact that she was the vehicle of so fine and perfect a love makes her beautiful in spite of her outward appearance. In Chris, Miss West has ably worked out the idea that his "normal" life with Kitty was mere show, and his real self lay in his submerged love for Margaret Allington. A most striking work.

The Pretty Lady, by Arnold Bennett (Cassell). The heroine of Mr. Arnold's new novel is Christine, a "daughter of joy," and she meets the middle-aged hero G. J. Hoape—who is usually addressed as G. J. by his friends—at the Promenade of a theatre in London. They go back to her flat. The war has been going on for over a year, and G. J. has occupied himself with various committees and meetings connected with the war, and has taken pains to do "his bit" efficiently and thoroughly. Two society ladies, Lady Queenie Paule and Concepcion Smith, come into the story, and through them Mr. Bennett gives a very vivid picture of certain aspects of London life during the war, with its war committees, dances, entertainments, and there is a most realistic description of a London air-raid. Christine and G. J. are together a great deal, and he gets very

fond of his "pretty lady" who is clever, an artist, and who possesses a sense of propriety and a strong sense of reality. She does not tell him of her visits to her church, and of her prayers to Our Lady of VII Dolours, and of her interest in her supposed protégé of the Virgin; he never suspects her of being a self-convinced mystic, and this side of her character, and all that her religion means to her, never occurs to G. J., although he thinks he is a good judge of people. And when he casts her off, "how in his human self-sufficiency could he be expected to know that he had judged the negligible Christine unjustly?"

This is a daring and haunting book. Mr. Bennett has drawn Christine with great courage, and in spite of her calling she is more appealing than the self-satisfied, middle-aged, rich G. J.

Robert Shenstone, by W. J. Dawson (John Lane), is the story of the life of a boy with literary aspirations. He wrote a number of poems when quite young, and the local printer to whom he takes his work for advice insists on calling him the "Boy Poet of Barton" on the title page of the book. Robert does not care for this description of himself, but he says the printer "had so set his heart on it, that I believe he would have refused to print the book without it." The outcome of the book of poems is that Robert is asked to teach at a school in London; he there comes into contact with types that he had never met before, and remains at the school until it comes to an inglorious end. He then collaborates with one of the other masters in writing a play which has a certain success. Robert then gives up literature for a time and becomes secretary to a lonely man, and is the means of clearing up a mystery connected with him. His next literary effort becomes a success, and we leave him happy in the possession of his heart's desire.

The plot of the book is very slight, but it is well written.

Joan and Peter, by H. G. Wells (Cassell). This latest novel of Mr. Wells' is the longest he has written. The story itself is very slight, but into it are interpolated Mr. Wells' ideas on life and its meaning. He discusses through his characters every problem—educational, political, and social, and into each argument he brings such fervour, careful thought, and confidence that he is able to throw much light on many a difficult problem in present affairs. Joan and Peter are born in the Victorian age; Peter in 1893 and Joan a year later, and they are being brought up together. Early in the story Peter's parents are drowned, and Oswald Sydenham, an East African explorer, is made their guardian. Oswald determines to find the best education in the world for his two wards; "but his researches had brought him to realise chiefly how poor and spiritless a thing was the very best formal education that the Empire could offer;" however, he at last finds something which satisfies him. Their childhood is conducted on the principle of freedom and inquiry, and they develop into attractive and clever children. Joan becomes a very original, clever, and beautiful girl, and Peter an attractive youth of the public school type. Oswald sends them both to Cambridge. The two are great companions, but sometimes "black and inexplicable moods" possess Joan, and then Peter's friends become hateful to her. Oswald is very fond of Joan's company; she had great gifts of conversation, she could talk well of "scenery, customs, atmospheres," but unlike Peter she

did not expound "ideas." An opportunity occurs, and Oswald takes Peter for a trip to Russia, and during this tour Oswald finds out how thoughtful and well-informed Peter is. The two young people take full advantage of all the amusements that the times afford, and Oswald in his generosity never checks them in any way. Oswald and Peter go to Dublin and there is much said on the Irish question; at this time Oswald was blind—"was not all Europe blind?—to the vast disaster that hung over him and his and the whole world, to the accumulated instability of the outworn social and political façade that now tottered to a crash. Massacre, famine, social confusion, world-wide destruction, long years of death and torment were close at hand; the thinnest curtain of time, a mere month of blue days now, hung between him and the thunderous overture of the world disaster." And then August, 1914, comes, and the whole of Joan and Peter's world is torn up, and "the education of Joan and her generation turned about and entered upon a new and tragic phase." Within the first month of the Great War nearly every one of the men in Joan's world "had been spun into the vortex." Joan, too, became useful by driving a car for the Ministry of Munitions and her career was a brilliant one. As time went on there was hardly a youth or man of Joan's acquaintance who was not either killed outright or crippled or in some way injured. Peter at first enlisted in the ranks, but later was transferred to the Royal Flying Corps; he is a success and goes to France. It is at this time that Joan discovers that she is in love with Peter, but Peter is unaware of this fact; their wooing is a very delightful thing. Peter is wounded—winged and lamed—and does not return to France again and the two marry. Oswald delivers his "valediction" the night before they leave him and the home of their childhood. "The time has come," he said, "for us to hold out our hands to every man in the world who is ready for a disciplined freedom."

Mr. Wells has written a powerful book, and it is packed with suggestive and stimulating ideas.

SCIENCE OF THE YEAR.

I. THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES.

As in recent years, the tendencies of physical science during 1918 were largely controlled by the necessities of war. Research in connexion with munitions of war continued to be carried out; many of the leading scientific workers were devoting their energies for the purposes of war; and pure science failed to excite even the moderate amount of interest usual in time of peace. No meeting of the British Association was held. With the return of peace, these conditions will no doubt be fundamentally altered. While the older men resume their normal work in colleges and universities, the younger men will be released from the Army, and are likely to return to science with renewed enthusiasm. If they suffer somewhat from the long break in education, it may be hoped that this deficiency may be to a great extent recompensed by their freedom from pedagogic trammels, and by their increased ardour in work to which their minds are fresh. The end of the year indeed displayed on all sides a tendency of hopefulness and confidence in the future. The war has set free powerful mental forces from their conventional channels. It seems not improbable that these will to some extent at least be diverted to the pursuit of science.

In astronomy the year witnessed the completion of a notable undertaking which had been in progress for a considerable number of years: namely, the establishment at the Mount Wilson Solar Observatory, Pasadena, California, of a telescope of far greater power than any hitherto erected. The suitability of this site for the largest telescope in the world is due to the clearness of the atmosphere and the relatively small number of nights on which observation is impossible. The scheme originated in 1906 with an offer by Mr. John D. Hookey of 45,000 dollars for the construction of the largest mirror possible for use in a reflecting telescope; and it was decided to aim at a diameter of no less than 100 inches. Many difficulties arose in the execution of so formidable a task. A mirror of 100 inches diameter would be 13 inches thick, and would weigh $4\frac{1}{2}$ tons. The difficulty of casting would therefore be enormous. A further difficulty was due to the fact that the surface must be paraboloidal, a spherical outline being insufficiently accurate for so large a mirror. In the course of construction the spherical form is first obtained, and the surface is then polished down to the paraboloidal form. How exact this process must be is indicated by the fact that the paraboloidal form departs from the spherical by less than one-thousandth of an inch at the point of maximum difference.

The mounting of so large a mirror presented a further problem; and

finally the necessity for obviating changes in focal length due to variations in temperature. This difficulty was overcome by the installation of refrigerating plant for the purpose of keeping the mirrors during the day at the normal night temperature.

The construction was carried out by the French Plate Glass Company of St. Gobain, France. Buildings were erected for working the mirror, an automatic heater being installed to maintain a constant temperature. The danger of scratches during polishing were avoided by means of double windows sealed to prevent the entrance of dust; by filtering the air, keeping the floor wet, and coating the walls and ceiling with shellac. The immense labour involved is shown by the subsidiary operations which were necessary. For testing the 100-inch paraboloidal mirror it was necessary first to construct a 60-inch plane mirror; and for testing the 60-inch plane mirror it was necessary to construct three spherical mirrors of varying aperture and radius.

After many trials the first disc was completed in 1908 and forwarded to California. It was there found, however, to contain numerous flaws, and was immediately rejected. Two years later, in 1910, a fresh disc was successfully cast, but it broke while being annealed. The same thing happened with another disc in 1911. At length a flawless disc was produced of 100 inches aperture, and 8 inches thickness, but it was considered that this was not sufficiently thick. It was therefore decided to commence work on the mirror which had previously been rejected. The flaws were found not to be of a serious nature, and at last in 1916 the mirror was completed. Its diameter is somewhat over 100 inches, its thickness varies from $11\frac{1}{2}$ inches at the centre to $12\frac{1}{2}$ inches at the edge, and its weight exceeds 4 tons.

Meanwhile the mounting for the mirror was in progress, and by the end of 1917 the telescope was nearly complete. The mounting itself weighs 100 tons; and the mountain road up to the Observatory had to be widened to enable the parts to be brought up. Especially delicate was the operation of bringing the mirror itself along this road, without risk of fracturing. During the present year many small adjustments still remained to be made before regular observations could be started. An admirable description of the telescope is furnished by Mr. H. Spencer Jones in the October number of *Science Progress*. This great telescope, working in the highly favourable atmosphere of the Californian mountains, is expected largely to increase our knowledge of the more distant parts of the stellar system, and may very likely cause considerable modification in current ideas as to the structure of the Universe.

Some attention was raised early in the year by an account given by Professor A. S. Eddington, F.R.S., of Gravitation and the Principle of Relativity. Professor Eddington started from the Michelson-Morley experiment of 1887, from which it was inferred that material bodies experience contraction in the direction of their motion through the ether. If motion through the ether is at the velocity of 161,000 miles a second, the contraction would amount to just one-half. According to this theory, turning an object through a right angle causes a fundamental alteration in all its dimensions. The shortening in the direction of the current of ether is, however, not perceived by the human eye, since it takes place

universally, affecting the eye itself just the same as the objects looked at. But it is none the less actual that it cannot be perceived.

The theory leads on to a new conception of gravitation. Our three-dimensional space and uni-dimensional time apply only where we are able to observe it. In remote parts of the Universe, the space-time form may be differently put together from the way in which we know it. The new suggested law of gravitation is to the effect that the sun, for instance, instead of exercising a direct attraction, radiates an influence which causes some alteration in the relations of space and time; and the earth's motion on account of the sun's gravitation is derived from its taking the shortest route through the modified space and time. This revised idea of gravitation (Einstein's Law) is found everywhere to account for the observed facts as well as the Newtonian Law, and in some cases better. A crucial test will probably be available at the total eclipse of the sun in 1919. It should then be possible to determine the question as to whether light has weight, as well as mass, as required by Newton's Law. The quantity of the weight observed will furnish a valuable test of Einstein's principle. The whole subject is interesting, as another instance of the closeness with which modern physics approaches to metaphysics. Nearly all suggested solutions of ultimate physical problems have now in them some element of metaphysics.

Studies as to the constitution of matter continued to be prosecuted during the year; and the results attained were certainly not less remarkable than those of preceding years. The conclusion was definitely established that an element is no longer to be regarded as homogeneous, but as a heterogeneous mixture of somewhat different substances. An element is a type of substance rather than a single thing. An element occupies one or other of the ninety-two possible places in the periodic table; but in many cases several different substances are found to occupy the same place; chemically they are the same element, though substantially they are not identical; these have been called isotopes, whereas the different elements themselves, occupying different places in the periodic table, are called heterotopes.

The distinction of isotopes is based upon their radio-active character. Before the introduction of this new criterion, the discrimination of the elements was carried out by the four criteria of atomic weight, chemical character, place in periodic table, and spectrum. The new criterion by radio-active character introduced new differentiations, unsuspected by any chemical or spectroscopic process. Polonium, actinium, and radium were discovered by its aid; and radium was soon shown to be a true element, having a distinctive atomic weight, chemical character, place in periodic table, and spectrum. On radium also was founded the proof of transmutation of the elements, for it was shown to be derived from uranium through a third element, ionium, and it ultimately became disintegrated to form helium. Polonium and actinium were also subsequently proved to be genuine elements according to the old chemical standard.

The astonishing discovery of the heterogeneity of the elements was made by investigation of the various disintegration products of the radium series. Every one of these was found to be chemically identical

with previously known elements. Thorium, for instance, having atomic weight 232, gave rise by ejection of an α -particle to mesothorium, atomic weight 228, but in all chemical characters is identical with radium whose atomic weight is 226. The ejection from mesothorium of a β -particle gives rise to a third substance radio-thorium, chemically identical with the original thorium, but retaining the same atomic weight as mesothorium, and therefore lighter than its "isotope" thorium by the weight of one helium particle. From this and other similar cases the generalisation was reached that every expulsion of an α -particle involved a shifting of two places in the periodic table, and a loss of four points in atomic weight; whereas every expulsion of a β -particle caused a shifting of one place in the opposite direction, but no loss of weight. The still wider generalisation was thus arrived at that the successive places in the periodic table represented unit increments of atomic charge. The α -particle is the atom of helium with two positive charges; the β -particle is the negative electron.

During the year a further element was discovered by radio-active methods, and christened eka-tantalum or proto-actinium, the last name being due to the fact that it gives immediate rise by ejection of one α -particle to actinium. It occupies place No. 91 in the periodic table, between thorium and uranium, and its average life is believed to be more than 1,000 but less than 10,000 years. The discovery of eka-tantalum was made independently by Soddy and Cranston, and by Hahn and Meitner.

A further new conclusion reached was that the ultimate product of disintegration of thorium was lead. The lead derived from thorium is not identical with that derived from uranium. They are isotopes of different atomic weight, the thorium variety being 208, and the uranium variety 206. A third isotope of lead has atomic weight 210, this being a very small percentage of the uranium product, namely, 0.03 per cent. of the main trunk arriving at radium-c. Common lead, with its atomic weight 207.2, is therefore not a single substance, but a mixture of the varieties coming respectively from thorium and uranium.

The present position thus shows a wonderful alteration in the conceptions of the older chemistry. We know of substances chemically identical but of different atomic weights; we know of substances chemically dissimilar but of the same atomic weight; and still more remarkable, we know of substances of the same chemical character and the same atomic weight, which yet are known by the radio-active test to be different. In the modern technical language there are heterobaric isotopes, there are isobaric heterotopes, and there are isobaric isotopes in a world where the older chemistry could distinguish only heterobaric heterotopes. Yet all these discoveries, revolutionary though they are, have not overthrown the fundamental conceptions of the atomic theory. Far from it: they have confirmed those conceptions in a way that Dalton and his followers could never have hoped for. For the atomic theory never was more than a working hypothesis. It was invented to account for the phenomena of chemical change, and the invention is now shown to represent a fact. The existence of atoms is no longer hypothetical; it is a genuine fact. Radio-activity is a new weapon of science, opening

up the new sphere of sub-atomic chemistry. It has confirmed the older chemistry in every particular, while carrying the torch of science into an altogether new region. It is a matter for profound astonishment that so many of the leading men of science of last century, and most notably of all Faraday, were able with the comparatively few weapons at their command to anticipate as they did the future course of discovery.

These new lines of research continue of course to be actively carried on. Behind the purely scientific interest which they excite, there is always the ancient hope of startling practical results by the transmutation of one element into another. Alchemy was a favourite belief in the middle ages. The progress of knowledge soon showed how visionary then were the hopes of being able to change one element into another. The further progress of knowledge has, however, enabled us actually to witness such changes going on. We know not only that it is possible, but that it happens. It is still not in our power to control or bring about these changes; but that this power may in course of time be attained has ceased to be a visionary hope, since we know that the thing actually happens in nature. So long as this fundamental human hope continues to find encouragement, researches in radio-activity are not likely to flag.

II. THE BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES.

Comparatively little work was done in pure biology during the year. A state of war is unfavourable to the prosecution of any science in the pure form, and most of all perhaps to biology which has little immediate bearing on the material interests of men. Moreover, there were no outstanding topics of universal biological interest; the Mendelian controversy had died down, and the science appeared to have entered upon a stage of silent progress in detail, rather than of controversy on great questions of general philosophic import or public interest.

Nevertheless, the biological sciences, like the physical sciences, have their practical applications; and those too of no less importance than the physical. It is from physiology, rather than from zoology and botany, that the applications arise. During the course of the war, physiologists found full scope for turning their special knowledge to the service of the State. The highly novel mode of life involved in trench warfare brought into prominence a number of novel diseases which taxed the full resources of physiological research. Again, the use of poisonous gases entailed a demand for physiological measures to counteract their effect. The prevention of disease in the Army was mainly a matter of physiology; and the success of the measures adopted was an absolutely indispensable prerequisite to victory. Once more, the shortage of food and consequent introduction of rationing early in the year brought into a new and significant prominence the whole question of the scientific basis of human nutrition. It was questions of this character that especially dominated the biological sciences during the year under review.

As regards the novel diseases which came to light during the war, that which attracted by far the most attention and public interest was the peculiar nervous condition called shell-shock. At an early stage it was perceived that shell-shock was mainly a form of hysteria. For a

long time, indeed, many held that it was of more material character. Punctate hæmorrhages in the brain seemed to resemble the hæmorrhages caused by carbon monoxide poisoning; it was noted that the sufferers from shell-shock had generally been exposed to the bursting of a shell in their immediate vicinity; and it was held that the nervous manifestations might be the physical result of poisoning by the gases generated in the explosion. But in the year under review this theory rapidly lost credence, and by the end of the year had been generally rejected.

The more familiar this mental complaint became—and unfortunately it became only too familiar—the more clearly it was perceived that it belonged to the old recognised group of hysteria, neurasthenia, and psychasthenia. Neurasthenic symptoms predominated among soldiers whose nervous systems had been slowly worn out by long exposure to mental hardships: hysterical symptoms predominated where a sudden catastrophe had precipitated the breakdown in an acute form. These symptoms were protean in their manifestations. Functional mutism, deafness, paralysis of all kinds, amnesia, anæsthesia, stupor—these were the forms commonly witnessed. Especially notable was the circumstance that shell-shock was very rarely found in men who were wounded. A physical wound appeared to give protection against the mental trauma.

The basis of all hysteria is in a dissociation of the personality. In the case of shell-shock the dissociation is brought about by a powerful and usually sudden emotion. The intensity of nervous action exceeds the conducting power of the association fibres, which break down, much as the safety fuse in an electric circuit breaks down when the current sent through it is too strong. The French who, since the time of Janet, have stood pre-eminent for their studies of hysteria, reached during the year a classification of war-neuroses into the “commotionné” and the “émotionné.” The latter form is strictly hysterical; the former is more of the nature of concussion, and characterised especially by cerebral inhibition and mental inertia.

The treatment of these conditions made rapid improvements during the year as knowledge of their nature became clearer. The foundation of the treatment was always suggestion; but the form of suggestion adopted varied with each physician. Those who had previously believed in the doctrines of Freud found a unique opportunity for the practice of psycho-analysis. In part the Freudian psychology was substantiated; in part it failed to “make good.” Hypnosis was attended with varying success, but by the end of the year had scarcely won the unquestioned superiority anticipated by many.

Late in the year it was suggested that the endocrine glands might be responsible, as well as the nervous system, for hysterical conditions. The suggestion seemed reasonable, for hysteria and shell-shock are instances of physiological disintegration; the work of integration in the healthy system is carried on by the endocrine glands as well as by the nervous system. Research on this subject is likely to be prosecuted in the coming year.

Another subject of biological interest during the year was, as we have already mentioned, that of human alimentation. Rationing of meat

and fats was introduced in February, and it was plainly a matter of urgent importance to determine what the requirements of the human body actually are. It was obvious from the first that heavy physical workers required more food than children, and that rations would have to be graded. The physiologists specially detailed to study this question reached the conclusion that the energy-requirements of the human body on the average, including men, women, and children, amount to 3,300 calories a day. The next question which had to be considered was the necessary minimum of the three ingredients of carbohydrate, protein, and fat. Clearly it was not necessary to specify any minimum of carbohydrates, for any diet of 3,300 calories must inevitably exceed the minimum by a large surplus. The International Scientific Commission investigating the matter came to the same conclusion about protein. Although meat was scarce, they held that physiologically this was of little importance; for a diet of 3,300 calories would be sure to contain sufficient protein, even though there were no meat in it at all.

With regard to fats the case was different. It was considered that 75 grams of fat *per diem* was the minimum needful for continued good health in the average civilian; and there is no doubt that during the early part of the year this standard was not attained by various classes of the population. Physiologically the shortage of food was most pronounced in the shortage of fats; and in the conditions then prevalent a further supply of meat would be valuable, not on account of their proteins, but on account of the large percentage of fat which they contain. Nothing of importance was done towards promoting knowledge of vitamins, those mysterious bodies which cannot be analysed, but which seem to be absolutely essential, if only in minute quantities, for the maintenance of health.

Scientific opinion as to the value of fat underwent some modification as the year went on; and a tendency became apparent to abandon the belief that any absolute minimum of fat was necessary at all. It was pointed out that many races subsisted satisfactorily on a diet containing far less fat than that pronounced to be necessary. Finally, the opinion gained ground that absence of fat from the diet might be largely, or perhaps wholly, compensated by a more than corresponding intake of carbohydrate. Thus the proportions consumed of the different classes of food would be a matter rather of physiological habit than necessity. Some races were accustomed to ingest large quantities of food in a bulky rather than a concentrated form. Others, such as the British, were accustomed to ingest smaller quantities, though having the same calorie-value, owing to their higher concentration. To these latter, fats were an acquired necessity, just as to the former a larger quantity of less concentrated food was an acquired necessity. Thus it appeared that perhaps the only universal necessity was for a certain daily minimum of calories. How these calories were divided between carbohydrates, proteins, and fats would be a matter of national habit: the psychological factor would be more important than the physiological. In another respect the opinion as to the need for fats underwent some change in the course of the year. It was stated at first that vegetable fats were equally valuable with animal fats, and vegetable proteins with animal proteins. Towards the end of the year, many physiologists

studying this question modified their earlier views. They acquired the belief that animal proteins and animal fats have certain advantages over the vegetable kinds, more particularly during the period of adolescence.

Further studies were carried out as to the influence of climate on food-requirements. It was generally agreed that within certain limits of temperature, the food-requirements of a human being do not vary. But when the temperature falls below the lower limit, increased quantities of food are necessary to provide the extra energy required for maintaining the warmth of the body. This increase of food-requirement is especially necessary, when the body is inadequately protected by clothing against the winter cold. It was further agreed that races of large stature required more food than races of smaller stature. Reviewing all these considerations as a whole, it must be admitted that no very definite conclusions issued on the general principles of human alimentation. The subject is so complex that physiology offers at present little solid guidance. The psychological factor of habit remains one of the most important elements to be reckoned with; and in point of fact food-distribution between the Allied countries was arranged with reference rather to the psychological requirements of each nation, than to their physiological or supposed physiological requirements. Much discussion was carried on as to the special dietary requirements of brain-workers. It was agreed on all sides that no additional intake of calories was necessary for the brain-worker as it is for the manual worker. But no agreement whatever was reached on the controversial question as to the best form for the food to take for persons whose occupations are mainly mental. Opinion of high authority leaned to the view, however, that for such persons the food should be perhaps less bulky and more concentrated than for the average man. This would indicate a higher proportion of protein and fats as compared with carbohydrates.

We have already referred to the controversy over the new psychology of Freud and Jung. Freud attributed functional nervous disorders to a "suppressed complex," which in his opinion always had a sex-association. Jung generally adhered to the views of Freud, but denied to the sexual element the high importance attached to it by that philosopher. Early controversy on the Freudian psychology turned very largely on this point, which was unfortunate, for the exaggerated doctrine of Freud as to the sex-causation of mental disorder tended to bring into discredit other parts of his system of more fundamental value. During the year, opinion steadily hardened against the sex-element of Freud's psychology, while it tended equally to grow in support of the theory of psycho-analysis. The view now prevalent is that much functional nervous disturbance is due to the unconscious suppression of some powerful emotion—often an emotion of fear experienced during childhood and long since forgotten by the waking consciousness. The emotion is suppressed and finds no natural outlet; it becomes so to speak hidden away in a corner of the mind, having no association with the remainder of the individual's personality. The individual himself has no consciousness of its existence, nor perhaps any recollection of its origin. So that the emotion persists as a thing by itself, cut off from

the conscious mind of the individual, hidden as it were in a dark corner, but continuing to fester, and to poison adjacent regions of conscious life. That an emotion thus unconsciously suppressed should often have to do with sex is probable enough. That it always has to do with it is quite an unnecessary and unlikely supposition. In active warfare, particularly, the soldier finds it necessary to suppress various natural emotions with much force; these become bottled up as an enclave in the mind. They have little effect on his ordinary conduct, but they are not destroyed. They exercise from time to time a sinister effect on his mental balance.

Treatment consists in the variety of hypnotism called psycho-analysis. The object is to drain away the suppressed emotion by restoring association with the main personality of the individual. In the case of emotions experienced during childhood, the endeavour of the psycho-analyst is to restore the patient's recollection of the event which originally produced the emotion. This is achieved by throwing him into a hypnotic or semi-hypnotic condition, allowing his thoughts to wander freely around the subject, and thus eliciting in piecemeal fashion the memory which it is desired to raise. Once the patient can be induced to recall that event the cure is established. The festering emotion is brought into association with the rest of the mind; free drainage is secured, and the evil symptoms pass away. In the case of soldiers suffering from shell-shock, they can as a rule be made very easily under hypnosis to live through the events of the time when they were stricken, and the emotional strain relieved by linking up with the main consciousness. It is noteworthy that whereas neurasthenic cases are hard to hypnotise, cases of hysteria can nearly always be hypnotised with great ease. The facility of hypnotising genuine shell-shock cases was made to some extent the basis of differential diagnosis with malingering; for malingerers do not readily submit to hypnosis.

The interest in spiritualism during the year was greater than it had been for a long time past. The calamities of war, which brought a personal loss to nearly every family, acted as a powerful incentive to a belief in any doctrine which alleged the possibility of inter-communication between the living and the dead. The books on this subject published during the year were exceptionally numerous, and in strong demand by the public, nor were their authors wholly confined to the ignorant and superstitious. It is to be feared that much fraudulent advantage was taken of the public credulity by professional mediums and others. The critical faculty was dimmed by the painful emotions of war; and the public to a greater degree than usual went astray after spurious science to the neglect of more reputable branches of philosophy and biology. There was, however, no reason to suppose that this was more than a passing phase.

No meeting of the British Association was held during the year, mainly on account of difficulties of travel, and discouragement of the use of the railways for other than Government purposes. The cessation of war at the end of the year seemed likely to bring about a renewed interest in science for its own sake, as apart from its applications of practical utility.

ART, DRAMA, AND MUSIC.

I. ART.

WHILE there is little to register in the annals of art throughout a year in which the culmination of hostilities has paralysed every peaceful movement, there is, nevertheless, a significance about what little there is which, even in ordinary circumstances, ought not to be passed over unobserved. For low as the stream of artistic activities has ebbed, it will certainly flow again; and we may well wonder how fully it will refill its more recently formed channels, or others that have long been dry; or whether again it may not overflow the banks altogether and reach marks that have never yet been touched.

The outstanding feature of this year's chronicle has been the employment of artists by the State to commemorate the war by portraits of its protagonists and pictures of its incidents. This, as might be expected, has absorbed the greater part of the time of our principal painters, most of whom had already been serving in arms and, no doubt, utilising their opportunities of observing the picturesque aspects of war long before their artistic services were officially requisitioned. It is too soon yet to review the whole of their achievements, but even a glance at what has already been exhibited will give us a general view of what has been accomplished. Before the opening of the year under review, various small exhibitions had been held, notably those of war pictures by Mr. Strang, Mr. Nevinson, and Mr. Muirhead Bone. Since then we have seen the work of Sir William Orpen, Mr. Will Rothenstein, and Mr. Eric Kennington, all of which has shown us how far the academical method of illustrating conventional heroics falls short of the insight and acute response to the opportunities offered by tremendous events displayed by artists who really are artists. Few, if any, of these works can in themselves be counted great pictures, or even such memorable embodiments of the sentiment of war as were Lady Butler's "The Roll Call" or Détaillé's "Le Bourget." But, on the other hand, they are such intensive realisations of the actuality of this hideous upheaval as to leave no doubt that when the time comes for them such pictures will far transcend anything that we have yet seen.

In December an exhibition of naval pictures, officially commissioned, was opened at the Grosvenor Gallery, and though the level of artistic merit was deplorably unequal, the absorbing interest of the subjects depicted—for the most part utterly new and strange to a public that only knows it is the greatest naval power without troubling itself about why, or how—contributed very largely to its success. Among the portraits Mr. Glyn Philpot's three-quarter lengths of Admirals Jellicoe, Keyes,

Tyrrwhit, and May did more than atone for the feebleness of the rest ; for in their virility, their simplicity, and their masterly welding of pure convention into solid artistic achievement, they seemed to embody the very spirit of their subjects and the deeds for which we desire to commemorate them.

The State, again, appeared as patron of the arts in connexion with a proposal for the establishment of a British Institute of Industrial Art. Towards the end of the year the Board of Trade announced that in connexion with the Board of Education and with the advice of representative members of the Royal Society of Arts, the Arts and Crafts Exhibition Society, the Art Workers' Guild, the Design and Industries Association, and various persons and organisations connected with manufacture and commerce, they had framed a scheme for the incorporation of an Institute with the object of raising and maintaining the standard of design and workmanship of works of industrial art produced by British designers, craftsmen, and manufacturers, and stimulating the demand for such works as reached a high standard of excellence. The Board of Trade as the Department dealing with industry, and the Board of Education as the authority controlling the Victoria and Albert Museum, proposed to achieve the objects of the Institute by

(a) A permanent exhibition in London of modern British works selected as reaching a high standard of artistic craftsmanship and manufacture.

(b) A selling agency attached to this exhibition.

(c) A purchase fund for securing for the State selected works of outstanding merit exhibited at the Institute.

(d) The establishment of machinery for bringing designers and art workers into closer touch with manufacturers, distributors, and others.

(e) The organisation of provincial and travelling exhibitions of a similar character.

Certainly the employment of the State revenues and resources in the energetic prosecution of such a scheme would do something to atone for the closing of the Galleries and Museums to the public during the last few years.

The Church has not, as yet, followed the State into the studio ; and the completion of Mr. Eric Gill's " Stations of the Cross " in Westminster Cathedral aggravates our loss ; recalling to mind the pronouncement of a former Bishop of London in reply to Benjamin West's offer to paint a series of pictures for St. Paul's, " that he would never open the doors of his Cathedral to popery." But so long as the tradesman goes to Church and the artist doesn't, there is not likely to be much, if any, improvement in the artistic atmosphere of our places of national worship.

In December it was announced that Sir Edward Poynter had resigned his position as President of the Royal Academy. Earlier in the year the Royal College of Art suffered a real loss by the resignation of Professor Lethaby. No changes have occurred, it is fortunate to note, in the Directorships of the public galleries, and it is equally satisfactory to record the appointment of three such eminently qualified trustees of the Wallace Collection as Viscount Dillon, Lord Carmichael of Skirling, and

Mr. Bowyer Nichols. The appointment of the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres as a trustee of the National Gallery is no less agreeable. The vacancy on the Board of the Tate Gallery occasioned by the death of Mr. Robert Ross—who, it may be mentioned, has of late years contributed the review of art to the *ANNUAL REGISTER*—has not yet been filled, but Mr. Frank Rinder has succeeded him as adviser to the Felton Trustees in Melbourne.

In the sale-rooms by far the most important event was the dispersal of the John Linnell Collection of the works of William Blake. A series of seventy-two drawings for illustrations of the works of Dante was sold for 7,300 guineas. A series of twenty-one designs for illustrations of the Book of Job for 3,800 guineas. And a series of twelve drawings for illustrations of "Paradise Regained" for 2,100 guineas. The Dante Series and some others were purchased by the National Art Collections Fund on behalf of a combination of the National Gallery of British Art, the Fitz-William Museum at Cambridge, the Corporations of Manchester and Birmingham, the British Museum, and the Felton Trustees in Melbourne. The respective shares allotted to the different members of this combination have not yet been announced, but the event is in the meantime noticeable, in relation to what has been above recorded, as possibly the first instance of what is vulgarly known in the sale-room as a "knock out" being organised and carried through by public officials of the State.

It may be allowed then that while the Chronicle of Events in the past year is short of its customary volume, it has a significance of many and great possibilities for the future. How far the private patronage of art may be affected by the general impoverishment of mankind engendered by four years' cessation from the production of wealth accompanied by the actual destruction of much that existed, it is as yet too soon to estimate; but the appearance of the State as an active patron of art is something that may mean a great deal.

II. DRAMA.

The theatrical year, in spite of a number of difficulties, turned out on the whole remarkably well. At one period the prevalence of air-raids constituted a strong incentive to a certain proportion of the public to stay at home; but later in the year a reaction took place, and large crowds flocked nightly to the theatres.

Various pieces ran continuously throughout the year, chief among these being "Chu Chin Chow," at His Majesty's, which passed its thousandth performance. "The Maid of the Mountains" at Daly's also continued to run throughout the year, ultimately breaking the record at that theatre. The record of the Adelphi was likewise broken by the run throughout the year of "The Boy," a musical version of Sir Arthur Pinero's "The Magistrate"; this piece passed its five hundredth performance. Another production of the previous year which met with uninterrupted success was "The Better 'Ole" at the Oxford, which only came to an end when the termination of hostilities caused it to lose its interest.

The sentiments and conditions of war were not favourable to Shakespearian productions; nevertheless something was done in this direction. The Royal Victoria Hall, popularly known as "The Old Vic," produced as usual a number of Shakespearian plays which acquired widespread popularity and regularly drew large audiences. This theatre celebrated its centenary by a special *matinée* on October 25, at which the Queen and Princess Mary were present.

At the end of October there was a very fine production of "Twelfth Night," by Mr. J. B. Fagan, at the Court Theatre, which met with great success, and showed no signs of slackening at the end of the year.

As regards new productions nothing very eventful has to be noted. On February 14 a new play of Sir Arthur Pinero was given at the New Theatre entitled "The Freaks," which was described as an "Idyll of Suburbia." This piece did not meet with the success which has generally attended the author's plays. On the 25th of the same month the Stage Society produced at the Court Theatre "The Dead City," a translation by Arthur Symons of D'Annunzio's tragedy "La Citta Morte." On February 5 the run began of a popular farce at the Savoy entitled "Nothing but the Truth," which had been adapted by James Montgomery from a novel by Frederick Isham. War plays were represented by Mr. Austin Page's "By Pigeon Post," a melodrama which attained one of the chief successes of the year. It was produced at the Garrick Theatre on March 30. On the 11th of that month "Romance" at the Lyric Theatre reached its thousandth performance. On April 11 a popular comedy, "The Naughty Wife," by Fred Jackson, elaborated and revised by Edgar Selwyn, made its appearance at the Playhouse. Miss Gladys Cooper, who took the chief part, first went into management with this play. On April 10 "The Knife," a drama by Eugene Walter, was produced at the Comedy and, winning a success which surpassed the anticipation of its supporters, was transferred on May 27 to the Queen's Theatre. Comedies continued to be the most popular form of entertainment, a notable example being that of "Nurse Benson," by R. C. Carton and Justin McCarthy, which was produced at the Globe Theatre on June 21.

July was conspicuous for several events of importance. On the 8th "The Story of the Rosary" was revived at the Lyceum. On the 10th Mr. Matheson Lang produced his own play, "The Purple Mask," at the Lyric. This piece, adapted from "Le Chevalier au Masque," by Paul Armont and Jean Manoussi, achieved wide success, Mr. Matheson Lang himself taking the leading part. On the 20th another very successful comedy was produced at the Royalty Theatre, *viz.*, Mr. Arnold Bennett's "The Title," which was still actively running at the end of the year. Ten days later "The Freedom of the Seas," by Walter Hackett, made its appearance at the Haymarket. Towards the end of August there was produced at the Drury Lane Theatre a "Spectacular Operette," called "Shanghai," by William Carey and Duncan Wylie, with music by Isidor Witmark. The same theatre celebrated on September 29 a pageant of "Old Drury" in celebration of the twenty-first year of the management of Mr. Arthur Collins.

Little alteration occurred during the year in the popular appreciation of revues and musical comedies. Among the most successful of these

were "The Bing Boys on Broadway" at the Alhambra, and "The Lilac Domino" at the Empire, both produced in February, and both still running at the end of the year. The former was written by Fred Thompson and Harry M. Vernon, with music by Nat. D. Ayer, and lyrics by Clifford Grey. The latter was the work of Harry D. Smith, with music by Charles Cuvillier.

No account of the drama of 1918 would be complete without mention of the serious loss sustained by the theatrical world and the public generally in the death of Sir George Alexander, the distinguished actor and manager of the St. James's Theatre, who died on March 16. A full account of his career will be found in the Obituary.

III. MUSIC.

So far as general activity is concerned there was as much public music to be heard in 1918 as in any of the preceding years of the war. Indeed it may be that there was even more, and decidedly there was no falling away from the higher standard that had been set in 1917. The fact that it was not open to all to give concerts for charity, which in reality were merely advertising mediums for the concert-givers, undoubtedly helped to raise the standard, so that in some respects, namely, in the matter of chamber music, it attained a very high level indeed. Still more gratifying was the progress that was made in respect of the higher development of operatic performances in English. During the year London was visited by the Royal Carl Rosa Company, and Sir Thomas Beecham's Company gave two lengthy seasons. Indeed it was these operatic performances which stamped the year. It was undoubtedly a remarkable fact that in spite of the great difficulties of railway transport these operatic companies were able not only to continue their former activities but also to augment them. Beecham opened his first season at Drury Lane on March 2, which lasted for five weeks, the second on June 3, which lasted till the end of July, and in both he adhered to his old policy of giving all performances in English with only English (or American) singers. As a large proportion of these had belonged to the company for a number of years, and as they had increased their experience largely under the same conductors more or less throughout, the audiences reaped the advantage, so that the general performances were undoubtedly better than before. It was a great point that, whether by accident or design, the perfection of ensemble was the aim, and that it was that was achieved. It remains to be seen if, when the foreign singers of world repute return to England, the audiences that Beecham and others have more or less created during the war will remain true to their present liking for good ensemble rather than for this or that prima donna or tenor; but the fact remains that in 1918 the public fully appreciated the beauty of the former. Few new singers came to the operatic front, for the obvious reason that war work of various kinds had absorbed so many who might otherwise have come into prominence. Beecham again had the services of Buckman, Licette, Brola, Thornton, Nelis, Clegg, Mullings, D'Oisly, Millar, Heather, Ranalow, Austin,

Parker, Allin, Radford, and so on, while his conductors, other than himself, were Pitt, Goossens, *père et fils*, Harrison, Wynn Reeves, and, after his release from his naval duties, Hamilton Harty. The repertory of the company was as good and as comprehensive as it well could be; in point of fact it may be doubted if any European subsidised opera house could have put forward one more comprehensive even in peace times. It included Mozart's "Figaro," "Magic Flute," and "Seraglio," "Aida," "Othello," "Trovatore," "Tristan," "Tannhäuser" (revived in very brilliant fashion), the favourite Puccini operas, "Louise," "Carmen," "Cavalleria," "Pagliacci," "Boris Godunov," and "Ivan the Terrible"; in the second season "The Valkyrie" was added. This extract from "The Ring" had not been heard in English on the London stage for about ten years, and it created something of a furore, with Hyde, Agnes Nicholls, Radford, Licette, and Parker in the cast. In this season also was revived Ethel Smyth's "The Boatswain's Mate," which now made a greater effect than before. Rather late in the season Beecham produced Rimsky-Korsakov's wonderful opera "The Golden Cockerel" in English. It had been heard in the Russian season at the same theatre in 1914 as ballet-opera; now it was given in its original state.

The Carl Rosa Company opened their season at the Shaftesbury on June 15, when they celebrated the jubilee of their foundation. With a repertory not quite so comprehensive as that of Beecham they yet did well, and produced Stephen Philpot's "Dante and Beatrice," a conventional opera that met with great success in the provinces. McCunn's "Jeanie Deans" was revived, and the remainder of the repertory was much the same as in the immediately preceding years.

In the concert world the Royal Philharmonic Society completed their 106th season under Beecham's control, while they opened the 107th season in December under entirely new auspices, Beecham having retired; the conductors of this latter season were Landon Ronald, Adrian Boult, and Geoffrey Toye. In the former season Beecham conducted the whole of the concerts save one, when Ronald took his place. During it there were performed Bantock's "Fifine at the Fair," Chabrier's "España," Debussy's "Three Nocturnes," extracts from Delius's "A Village Romeo," Elgar's "Enigma Variations," Julius Harrison's "Rapunzel," Holbrooke's "Queen Mab," Wallace's "Villon," and Ethel Smyth's "On the Cliffs of Cornwall." Among the soloists were Tyas, Thornton, Mullings, Allin, all members of Beecham's Opera Company, de Greef, Moisevich, Sammons, Tertis, Beatrice Harrison; during the season the Society gave its 800th concert. The 22nd season of symphony concerts of the Queen's Hall orchestra duly took place under Sir Henry Wood's conductorship, and for the most part familiar works were forthcoming. The novelties were the American Converse's symphonic poem, "Ormazd," Rimsky-Korsakov's "Symphoniette on Russian Themes," Glazunov's "Two Preludes," Roger Ducasse's "Le Joli jeu de Furet," Kusanli's "Nuit de Carnaval," Florent Schmitt's "Le Palais Hanté," and Samazeuilh's "Le Sommeil de Canope." D'Alvarez, Rosovsky, Kirkby Lunn, Gervase Elwes, de Greef, Moisevich, Murdoch, Borwick, Adela Verne, Hess, Scharrer, Sammons, Suggia, and Beatrice Harrison were the soloists. The Royal Choral Society added to its familiar repertory

Elgar's "The Spirit of England," Vaughan Williams's "Sea Symphony," Stanford's "Songs of the Fleet," and Parry's "Chivalry of the Sea"; Sir Frederick Bridge, who at the end of the year announced his retirement from the post of organist at Westminster Abbey, which he had held for close upon fifty years, was the conductor. The Promenade Concerts duly took place in the early autumn in Queen's Hall, under the direction of Robert Newman, and the conductorship of Sir Henry Wood, who at one time seemed likely to accept the conductorship of the Boston Symphony Concerts, U.S.A.; there was a controversy in the autumn as to the deterioration of the Promenade programmes.

The Chappell and Boosey Ballad Concerts went their way during the year, the former being distinguished by the excellent small orchestra conducted by Alick Maclean. Adrian Boult gave a series of orchestral concerts in Queen's Hall in the autumn in conjunction with the London Symphony Orchestra, when his programmes included Vaughan Williams's "London Symphony," and other neglected native works. Isidore de Lara abandoned his War Emergency Concerts which he had directed since the early days of the war, and developed a new series of excellent chamber concerts of English music; he also organised a series of three Italian concerts in Queen's Hall in the summer. The Oriana Madrigal Society, the South Place Institute, the London Trio, the London String Quartet (who gave several series of first-rate chamber concerts under the name of Pops), the Catterall Quartet, all continued their wonted activities as did the Ortman and Kimpton orchestras. Sunday concerts raged as before. Ronald produced Stanford's "Verdun" at an Albert Hall concert. Recitals both instrumental and vocal were to be numbered by the hundred, and during the year London welcomed the bands of the Italian Carabinieri, at whose concert in the Albert Hall the King and Queen of the Belgians were present, they having arrived by aeroplane from France, and of the Armée Belge.

A great controversy arose over the gross neglect of music during the week following the signing of the armistice, which resulted in the foundation of a Society intended to prevent such blunders in the future; at the Coliseum music-hall the feature of the latter part of the year was the remarkable success of Diaghileff's Russian Ballet Company. During the year Sir Hubert Parry died, and was buried in St. Paul's Cathedral. He was succeeded as Director of the Royal College of Music by Dr. H. P. Allen, who a little earlier in the year had become Professor in Music at Oxford. At the very end of the year Sydney H. Nicholson was appointed organist at Westminster Abbey in succession to Sir Frederick Bridge. Dr. McNaught, for long editor of the *Musical Times*, died in November.

FINANCE AND COMMERCE IN 1918.

FOR the fourth year in succession the economic activities of the country—indeed of the greater part of the world—were entirely subordinated to the needs of war. Fortunately the closing months of 1918 saw a cessation of hostilities, after a period of 4½ years, in circumstances foreshadowing the conclusion of a peace that would be a triumphant vindication of a cause for which millions of human beings have shed their blood and untold amounts of treasure have been blown sky high. But the war has left indelible marks on the economic fabric. The industrial aspect of this country, as of other belligerents, has been entirely transformed. How much so is at present scarcely realised, but the transition from war to peace will be a long, and, mayhap, a painful process.

The chief business of Finance during the past year was to provide the sinews of war, and it has provided all that was required, which was greater than that in any previous year, with a dexterity that four years of war had taught it. Four Votes of Credit were passed as follows: March, 600,000,000*l.*; June, 500,000,000*l.*; August, 700,000,000*l.*; and November, 700,000,000*l.* This brought the total number of Votes for the war up to twenty-five, the amounts in the respective financial years being as follows:—

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| 1914-15 (eight months) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | £362,000,000 |
| 1915-16 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1,420,000,000 |
| 1916-17 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2,010,000,000 |
| 1917-18 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2,450,000,000 |
| 1918-19 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2,500,000,000 |
| Total | | | | | | | | <u>£8,742,000,000</u> |

Out of these Votes of Credit 1,465,000,000*l.* had been lent to our Allies from the beginning of the war down to the middle of November, while 218,500,000*l.* had been lent to the Dominions. Russia had borrowed 568,000,000*l.*, France 425,000,000*l.*, Italy 345,000,000*l.*, and the smaller States between them 127,000,000*l.* Our average expenditure which in 1914-15 was 1,500,000*l.* a day, and rose to 3,750,000*l.* in 1915-16, to 6,583,000*l.* in 1916-17, and to 6,986,000*l.* in 1917-18, fell to 6,688,000*l.* in the first seven months of the financial year ending March 31, 1919. This figure was 298,000*l.* less than the budget estimate which was 6,986,000*l.* a day. In the year ended March 31, 1918, the revenue reached the unprecedented figure of 707,234,565*l.*, an increase of 133,806,983*l.* on 1916-17, and of 370,467,741 on 1915-16. Excess profits duties yielded 220,214,000*l.* and income tax 239,509,000*l.* The total revenue was equal to over 26 per

cent. of the total expenditure, which was 2,696,221,405*l.*, tax revenue providing 613,042,000*l.* or 22½ per cent. Despite the enormous growth in the revenue, Mr. Bonar Law imposed additional taxation in 1918. He raised the maximum rate of income tax from 5*s.* to 6*s.* in the pound, and increased the super-tax from a maximum of 3*s.* 6*d.* to 4*s.* 6*d.* in the pound, the latter also being made to start on incomes of 2,500*l.* instead of 3,000*l.* Incomes up to 500*l.* a year were exempted from the increases made in 1918 owing to the increased cost of living, and also because the recipients of those incomes had suffered severely from the changes made in earlier budgets, particularly the budget of September, 1915. The stamp duty on cheques was increased from 1*d.* to 2*d.* despite strong protests that it would produce little revenue but augment the inflation of the currency. A more important change was the abolition of the penny postage on letters. The minimum charge for letter carrying was raised to 1½*d.*, and that for postcards to 1*d.*, the halfpenny postage, except for printed matter, being abolished at the same time. Apparently, because indirect taxation in 1917-18 yielded only 118,250,000*l.* against 134,750,000*l.* in 1916-17, substantial additional taxation was imposed under the 1918-19 budget, chiefly on spirits, beer, and tobacco. The duty on spirits was raised from 14*s.* 9*d.* to 30*s.* per gallon, that on beer from 25*s.* to 50*s.* per standard barrel, and that on tobacco from 6*s.* 5*d.* to 8*s.* 2*d.* per lb. Mr. Bonar Law estimated the expenditure for the year 1918-19 at the enormous total of 2,972,197,000*l.*, of which Votes of Credit were estimated to account for 2,550,000,000*l.* Debt charges alone he put at 315,000,000*l.* Including 67,800,000*l.* of new taxation, he estimated the revenue to mark the "record" figure of 842,050,000*l.*, leaving a deficit to be found by borrowing of 2,130,147,000*l.* A tax on luxuries was proposed, but dropped when the difficulties of making such an impost were realised. The bulk of the money required to finance the war in 1917 was provided by the issue of the 5 per cent. War Loan, an issue of the fixed subscription period variety. In 1918 the bulk was provided by a continuous loan, namely, National War Bonds. These bonds yielded to the Exchequer during the twelve months no less than 1,224,835,742*l.* From the time that they were first put on sale in October, 1917, down to January 11, 1919, 1,446,625,613*l.* of these bonds were sold, and in addition 49,812,240 of small Post Office bonds were subscribed for by January 4. The first series of bonds were withdrawn from sale on March 31, when a second series was placed on sale, redeemable six months later than the first series. Following the raising of the income tax, the price of issue of the 4 per cent. Tax-Compounded Bonds was raised to 101½ per cent., but the price of the five, seven, and ten year 5 per cent. bonds remained at par. A third series was placed on sale on October 1, 1918. Propaganda methods for the sale of the bonds were much improved in 1918, and "tanks" were employed as collecting banks with great success. By December 28 sales of War Savings Certificates had reached 278,091,186 in number, representing in money 214,021,000*l.*, of which 102,000,000*l.* was received by the Exchequer during 1918. Successful efforts were made to cheapen still further the cost of temporary war borrowings, and the rate of discount on Treasury Bills, which at the end of the year 1917 was 4½ per cent., was reduced to 3½ per cent. On

balance only 36,565,000*l.* was borrowed on Treasury Bills during the year, the total outstanding being increased by this amount to 1,094,740,000*l.* But 176,399,700*l.* against 107,877,500*l.* was borrowed in the form of Ways and Means advances, making the total outstanding on December 31 last 455,180,750*l.* Thus the floating debt was increased in 1918 by 212,964,700*l.* as against only 50,903,500*l.* in 1917. But approximately 200,000,000*l.* less was borrowed abroad. The total was 455,160,482*l.* against 650,476,342*l.* in 1917.

Mr. Joseph Kitchin, F.S.S., has made a calculation of the gross cost of the war on the basis of the war lasting to the end of July next, *i.e.*, five years. He puts the direct war costs of the Entente countries at 24,845,000,000*l.* sterling; their pre-war debt at 4,565,000,000*l.*, and their post-war debt at 25,350,000,000*l.* On a 5 per cent. interest basis the post-war interest charge will be 1,270,000,000*l.* a year against a pre-war charge of 170,000,000*l.* The enemy war costs Mr. Kitchin puts at 14,070,000,000*l.* and their post-war debt at 14,650,000,000*l.*, and the interest charge at 776,000,000*l.* yearly against 54,000,000*l.* before the war. These figures give a grand total war cost of 38,915,000,000*l.*, and a post-war debt of 40,000,000,000*l.* against a pre-war debt of 5,775,000,000*l.* The annual interest charge will be 2,046,000,000*l.* against 224,000,000*l.* before the war. These figures give some idea of the extent to which the belligerents have mortgaged their future wealth. The loss meanwhile of 10,000,000 potential wealth producers adds to the problem of producing such an amount of extra wealth as will enable the burden of war debt to be carried successfully.

The course of monetary events in the past year, as in the previous three years, was entirely determined by war conditions. Government finance was indeed the only influence which affected Lombard Street, and the old causes that used to agitate it, very profoundly sometimes, failed to provoke even the smallest ripple upon its placid surface. Bank Rate remained at 5 per cent. throughout the year, as compared with an average of 5*l.* 3*s.* per cent. in 1917. Thanks to the differentiation made between foreign money and domestic funds, the average rate for three months' bank bills was only 3*l.* 11*s.* 9*d.* per cent. against 4*l.* 16*s.* 2*d.* in 1917, and the rate for short loans was 3*l.* 5*s.* 6*d.* per cent. against 4*l.* 8*s.* 3*d.* per cent. in 1917. As from the beginning of June it was arranged to place the rate of interest allowed on deposits by the banks on the flat basis of 3 per cent. This arrangement, which involved the abolition of competition for deposits among the banks, was come to in order to stimulate sales of National War Bonds by widening the margin between deposits and War Bonds in favour of the latter. As a result of this arrangement the banks' deposit rates averaged 3*l.* 1*s.* 3*d.* against 4*l.* per cent. in 1917. It may be of interest to set out for reference purposes the course of monetary rates during the war period :—

BANK RATE.

| 1914. | 1915. | 1916. | 1917. | 1918. |
|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| £ s. d. 4 0 9 | £ s. d. 5 0 0 | £ s. d. 5 9 3 | £ s. d. 5 3 0 | £ s. d. 5 0 0 |
| DISCOUNT RATE (3 MONTHS' BILLS). | | | | |
| 2 17 8 | 3 14 1 | 5 4 3 | 4 16 2 | 3 11 9 |
| BANKS' DEPOSIT RATE. | | | | |
| 2 2 4 | 2 12 0 | 3 14 4 | 4 0 0 | 3 1 3 |
| SHORT LOAN RATE. | | | | |
| 2 4 3 | 2 18 4 | 4 12 8 | 4 8 3 | 3 5 6 |

The rate allowed by the Bank of England to clearing banks for 3-day deposits of their surplus funds was reduced from 4 to 3½ per cent. on January 2, and to 3 per cent. on February 14. But the rate allowed by the Bank of England on foreign money remained throughout the year at 4½ per cent. This considerable differentiation had the result of materially lowering the rate for Treasury Bills. These were daily on sale, in the form of three and six months' maturities, throughout the year. At first the rate of discount was 4 per cent., but it was reduced to 3½ per cent. on February 14. A beginning was made with internal reforms at the Bank of England. Sir Gordon Nairne, the Chief Cashier, was appointed to a newly created office, that of Comptroller, and Sir Charles Addis, a practical banker of marked ability, was elected a Member of the Court, thus breaking the ancient tradition that the Bank of England directorate should not include a banker.

The outstanding feature on the Stock Exchange was the general appreciation of securities, for the first time since the Boer War. During the year the 387 representative securities, included in the *Bankers' Magazine* calculations, rose in value by 200,000,000*l.* to 2,801,089,000*l.* In 1917 there was a net depreciation of 158,000,000*l.* Since the outbreak of war these securities show a net depreciation of 571,000,000*l.* Practically all classes of securities contributed to the improvement, but more especially bank shares, brewery stocks, and industrial and commercial securities. Business was more active than it was in any of the previous war years, and for the first time since August, 1914, some firms made a profit. The happier experience of the Stock Exchange was due to the excellent profits made by practically all classes of companies.

The feature of the country's foreign trade was a huge increase in imports, which reached the unprecedented figure of 1,319,338,591*l.* This total was 255,173,913*l.* larger than in 1917, and 370,832,099*l.* in excess of that for 1916. Exports, however, decreased by 28,606,681*l.* to 493,478,065*l.*, and re-exports by 38,721,432*l.* to 30,956,629*l.* Higher prices accounted

for a large proportion of the increase in imports, as the following figures taken from the *Economist's* index number shows:—

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| Basis (being the average of 1901-5) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2200 |
| July, 1914 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2565 |
| December, 1915 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3634 |
| December, 1916 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4908 |
| December, 1917 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5845 |
| December, 1918 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6094 |

This advance in prices of commodities is to be attributed to the increase in purchasing power that was in the hands of the public as represented by Currency Notes and Bank of England Notes, the amounts of which increased as follows:—

| | Currency Notes Outstanding. | Bank of England Note Circulation. |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| December 30, 1917 | £212,450,950 | £46,591,020 |
| June 30, 1918 | 256,227,516 | 54,902,910 |
| December 31, 1918 | 323,644,400 | 70,190,250 |

The amount of cheques which passed through the London Bankers' Clearing House reached the record total of 21,197,512,000*l.*, an increase on 1917 of 2,076,316,000*l.* The influence mainly responsible for the increases in the cheque clearing and the paper currency were heavy Government borrowing and disbursements, and this influence was more pronounced in 1918 than in 1917.

The movement towards the creation of larger industrial and business units gathered considerable momentum in 1918. Experience during the war has taught manufacturers the advantages to be obtained from large scale working in the direction of lower production costs, higher efficiency of labour and machinery, and consequent increased production. One of the most important of the amalgamations effected was the merging of about thirty explosive manufacturing concerns into one great organisation, called Explosive Trades Ltd., with a capital of 18,000,000*l.* Various combinations were also effected in the engineering, iron, steel, electrical, and textile industries. The formation of these large industrial units resulted in a greater concentration of banking units. Following the fusion of the London and South-Western Bank and London and Provincial Bank, Barclays in July arranged to absorb the combined institution, and in the same month Lloyds Bank absorbed the Capital and Counties Bank and acquired control of the National Bank of Scotland, and the London and River Plate Bank. The London City and Midland Bank acquired the London Joint Stock Bank, and the London County and Westminster absorbed Parr's Bank, and the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Bank, while the National Provincial Bank took over the Bradford District Bank and Biggerstaff's banking house. An amalgamation was also effected of Martin's Bank and the Bank of Liverpool. The rapidity with which these banking combinations took place provoked considerable adverse comment, and a Committee of Inquiry was appointed to investigate the case for and against banking fusions. As the result of this Committee's recommendations the Government decided that Treasury permission should be first obtained before any further

amalgamations were carried out. An Advisory Committee was set up for the purpose of advising the Treasury on bank fusion schemes, and one scheme at least was dropped owing to Treasury opposition. Another important development of the year was the drawing up of a scheme for reviving, in accordance with modern ideas and practice, the commercial side of the activities of the old Levant Company, which in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was the head and front of British influence in the Near East. A parent Levant Company was formed with a capital of 1,000,000*l.*, together with a number of subsidiary companies. The former acquired control of various local enterprises, including the National Bank of Turkey. The scheme was the most important enterprise undertaken by the British Trade Corporation since its formation in 1917.

Shipbuilding statistics for the period of the war are now fairly complete. They show that the work of the period was low as compared with that of the years immediately preceding the war, and if naval work is included it does not inflate the tonnage figures to anything like the extent that would have resulted from the same amount of work concentrated on merchant ships. Including naval work, the Clyde output in 1918 was nearly 556,000 tons, which is the highest total for any of the five war years, but 200,000 tons less than in 1913. The total number of vessels built in 1918 in the United Kingdom was 1,245, having a tonnage of 1,876,411, and engines of 4,349,306 i.h.p. The standard cargo ships programme of the Ministry of Shipping was introduced too late for its full benefit to be secured during the war, for the great deal of organisation and work of adaptation which shipbuilders had to effect in order to build vessels from common designs, common drawings, and from materials in standard sizes from common sources of supply, was scarcely completed before hostilities ceased. In all probability the organisation which Lord Pirrie set up would very soon have begun to result in a largely increased output. The naval shipbuilding record of the Clyde for the past five years is a wonderful tribute to its work in maintaining British naval supremacy without which the war could not have been won. The various yards produced 481 vessels of 770,347 tons, of 6,093,830 i.h.p. Many new records were made—and broken—in the English yards, and large new steel shipyards were built by private firms as well as by the State. Concrete shipyards were started at Amble, Sunderland, and Thornaby-on-Tees, and a feature of work on the Thames was the establishment of yards for the construction of concrete ships up to 3,000 tons apiece. The British mercantile marine may have a difficult time ahead of it, but its achievements in the past, and particularly in the war period, leave no doubt of its capacity to overcome the tasks which lie ahead of it.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT ON INDIAN CONSTITUTIONAL REFORMS, SIGNED BY THE VICEROY AND SECRETARY OF STATE. (PUBLISHED JULY 6.)

A SHORT introduction, describing briefly the work performed by Mr. Montagu's Mission whilst in India, closes on a grave and serious note indicating the spirit in which the solution of a great problem has been sought.

"We do not suppose that any words of ours are needed to express our sense of the gravity of the task which we have attempted. The welfare and happiness of hundreds of millions of people are in issue. We have been called upon to revise a system of government which has been constructed by builders who, like ourselves, had no models before them, during a century and a half of steadfast purpose and honourable aim; a system which has won the admiration of critical observers from many lands, and to which other nations that found themselves called upon to undertake a similar task of restoring order and good government in disturbed countries have always turned for inspiration and guidance. England may be proud of her record in India. She should have even greater reason for pride in it in future. Because the work already done has called forth in India a new life, we must found her government on the co-operation of her people, and make such changes in the existing order as will meet the needs of the more spacious days to come, not ignoring the difficulties, nor under-estimating the risks, but going forward with good courage in the faith that, because our purpose is right, it will be furthered by all that is best in the people of all races in India. But the fact that we are looking to the future does not mean that we are unmindful of the past. The existing edifice of government in India is a monument to the courage, patience, and high purpose of those who have devised and worked it, to which, before we set about explaining our own proposals, it is fitting that we pay our imperfect tribute."

Part I. of the Report, headed "The Material," begins appropriately by reciting the pronouncement of August 20, "the most momentous utterance ever made in India's chequered history," for "it marks the end of one epoch and the beginning of a new one." Throughout the epoch which is now ending "we have ruled India by a system of absolute Government, but have given her people an increasing share in the administration of the country and increasing opportunities of influencing and criticising the Government." The development during recent years of the political situation which led to the pronouncement is rapidly surveyed; the disappointment that followed the practical application of the

Morley-Minto reforms ; the circumstances that to a great extent defeated the purposes of two great Royal Commissions, the Decentralisation Commission, and the Public Services Commission, and, in spite of the deep impression made by the Royal visit to India in 1911, the steady growth of Indian demands for more substantial share in the actual government, of Indian opposition to all measures that could be regarded as "repressive," even when political agitation assumed the most dangerous forms, or as evidence of racial discrimination ; then the outbreak of the great war, the outburst of universal loyalty to the cause of the Empire, the failure of all the plots engineered abroad to create trouble in India ; the ready acceptance of the necessarily drastic provisions of the Defence of India Act ; the admission of Indian representatives to the great Imperial War Conference in London, in response to a growing desire to improve the status of India in the Empire ; the revival of political controversies as the war dragged on, and the new demands, based on the right of self-determination, for self-government, culminating in the resolutions of the Congress and the Moslem League (the latter reflecting a marked change in the Mohammedan point of view), and the formation of the Indian Home Rule League. The Report takes note both of the more encouraging and the more disquieting symptoms. But, it argues—

"For the real and lasting effects of the war on India's destiny we should look neither to the generous help of the Princes, nor to the loyalty of the people as a whole, nor to the misguided activities of revolutionary gangs, nor yet to the attitude of the political leaders. They must be sought deeper and, we think, in two main directions. First, the war has given to India a new sense of self-esteem. She has, in the words of Sir Satyendra Sinha, 'a feeling of profound pride that she has not fallen behind other portions of the British Empire, but has stood shoulder to shoulder with them in the hour of their sorest trial.' She feels that she has been tried and not found wanting, that thereby her status has been raised, and that it is only her due that her higher status should be recognised by Great Britain and the world at large. The war has given an interest in public affairs to many thousands who were indifferent before. Many men, using language familiar to them in the past, claim that she should receive some boon as a reward for her services, but we do not think that this expresses the general feeling well or justly. We prefer to say that we find a general belief that India has proved herself worthy of further trust and of a more liberal form of government, and that whatever changes are made should be made in recognition of her own progress rather than as the reward for any services which she has rendered. Further, the war has come to be regarded more and more clearly as a struggle between liberty and despotism, a struggle for the right of small nations and for the right of all people to rule their own destinies. Attention is repeatedly called to the fact that in Europe Britain is fighting on the side of liberty, and it is urged that Britain cannot deny to the people of India that for which she is herself fighting in Europe, and in the fight for which she has been helped by India's blood and treasure. The revolution in Russia in its beginning was regarded in India as a triumph over despotism ; and notwithstanding the fact that it has since involved that unhappy country in anarchy and dismemberment, it has given

impetus to Indian political aspirations. The speeches of English and American statesmen, proclaiming the necessity for destroying German militarism, and for conceding the right of self-determination to the nations, have had much effect upon political opinion in India, and have contributed to give new force and vitality to the demand for self-government, which was making itself more widely heard among the progressive section of the people."

The genesis of the pronouncement of August 20 is thus described :—

"On all sides it was felt that the situation demanded new handling. The latter part of Lord Hardinge's term of office was largely devoted to a preliminary and informal examination of the changes which were possible and prudent; and Lord Chelmsford's first act was to take up the inquiry from the point where his predecessor left it, and to concentrate attention in the first place on a declaration of policy. The Cabinet's preoccupation with the war inevitably delayed the decision of questions so delicate and complex; and while the discussions between India, the India Office, and the Cabinet were proceeding came Mr. Chamberlain's resignation of his office as Secretary of State. India had learned during his tenure of office, and especially from the lips of her three delegates to the War Conference, how generously and steadfastly he had served her interests, and his retirement was as much regretted in that country as in England. Meanwhile the difficulties of administration in India were rapidly increasing. Lord Chelmsford's Government felt that without the declaration of policy for which they were pressing, it was impossible for them to act effectively on a directed course. The announcement of August 20 cleared the situation and was hailed with almost as much relief by the authorities as satisfaction by the politicians."

Chapter II. of the Report reviews the growth of the present system of administration from the beginnings of Parliamentary control in Lord North's Regulating Act of 1773 and the far more important measure known as Pitt's Act of 1784, to the formal transfer of the East India Company's powers to the Crown "when the Indian Mutiny sealed the fate of the greatest mercantile corporation in the world." It then proceeds to examine how Parliament actually exercises control over Indian affairs, and arrives at the reasoned conclusion that :—

"... The interest shown by Parliament in Indian affairs has not been well-sustained or well-informed. It has tended to concern itself chiefly with a few subjects, such as the methods of dealing with political agitation, the opium trade, or the cotton excise duties. It may be well to record that in India such spasmodic interferences are apt to be attributed to political exigencies at home. Our own study of political development in India has led us, notwithstanding the force of these arguments, to one important conclusion. It is that Parliament's omission to institute regular means of reviewing the Indian administration is as much responsible as any single cause for our failure, in the face of growing nationalist feeling in India, to think out and to work out a policy of continuous advance. For this failure it would be unfair to blame the Government or the services of India. They have been abundantly occupied with their own heavy tasks, and they have lacked instructions from those whose business it was to give them."

The supremacy of Parliament over Indian affairs is complete, but a distinction must be drawn between the powers of control and the measure to which they have been exercised.

"The relations between Simla and Whitehall vary also with the personal equation. If resentment has been felt in India that there has been a tendency on occasions to treat Viceroys of India as 'agents' of the British Government, it is fair to add that there have been periods when Viceroys have almost regarded Secretaries of State as the convenient mouthpiece of their policy in Parliament."

A careful examination of the way in which the Executive Government has been built up and is now conducted leads up to the following conclusions :—

"Let us now try to realise the burden of government in India. If we set aside imperative necessities which may lead to a great temporary expansion of Governmental activity, as in England at present, and also theories of the intrinsic merits of State management which find favour with some schools of political thought, we may say broadly that the degree of intervention by the State in the lives of its people varies with their own capacity and disposition to direct the material business of their lives. The great mass of India's people are illiterate peasants, living in mud-built villages, and cultivating small holdings of land, the produce of which is only too often threatened by drought or deluge. The physical facts of India, the blazing sun, the enervating rains, have doubtless coloured the mental outlook of the masses of her people. The Hindu caste system, with its segregating effect, circumscribes the range of public opinion by limiting the range of personal sympathies, and tends to perpetuate many customs and usages which progressive Indians themselves recognise as a grievous impediment to progress. Moreover, the political disintegration which preceded British rule utterly destroyed any incentive to material improvement or progress by laying its results at the mercy of the first raider. It was inevitable, therefore, that when the government of the country was assumed by the vigorous and practical British race they should have formed a conception of their responsibilities towards the people wider than that accepted for their own land."

As to the relations between the Government of India and the Provincial Governments, the Report, whilst admitting that the latter are in a sense merely agents for the former, and endorsing to some extent the recommendations of the Decentralisation Commission that both the powers and responsibilities of the Provincial Governments should be materially increased—recommendations which were carried considerably farther in a despatch addressed by Lord Hardinge's Government to the India Office in 1911, in anticipation of the Royal announcement at the Delhi Durbar—points out that the question now turns mainly upon new and bigger considerations :—

"Official control from above is incompatible with popular control from within, and the admission of the latter justifies, indeed demands, a corresponding reduction of the former. Parliament, the Secretary of State, and the Government of India must all relax control if the legislative councils in the provinces are to share the responsibility for the

administration. Similarly Provincial Governments must abate their superintendence where popularly constituted subordinate authorities have been entrusted with functions of their own.

Chapter III. reviews the growth of legislative bodies in India. Originally they were merely committees for the purpose of making laws, debarred from inquiring into grievances or examining the conduct of the Executive, and deliberative only in respect of the immediate matter for legislation before them. The Act of 1861 introduced a non-official and small Indian element for the purposes of advice. Lord Lansdowne's Act of 1892, initiated under Lord Dufferin's Administration, went considerably farther, introduced the principle of election, though the word was sedulously eschewed, and, by giving the Councils the right to ask questions and to discuss, though not to vote, on the Budgets, recognised that their functions were henceforth to be more than merely legislative or merely advisory. The impulses which led to the Morley-Minto reforms were "partly internal, partly external."

"The problem which Lord Minto's Government set themselves to solve was how to fuse in one single government the two elements which they discerned in the origins of British power in India. They hoped to blend the principle of autocracy derived from Moghul emperors and Hindu kings with the principle of constitutionalism derived from the British Crown and Parliament; to create a constitutional autocracy, which, differing *toto celo* from Asiatic despotisms, should bind itself to govern by rule, should call to its counsels representatives of all interests which were capable of being represented, and should merely reserve to itself in the form of a narrow majority predominant and absolute power. They hoped to create a constitution about which conservative opinion would crystallise and offer substantial opposition to any further change. They anticipated that the aristocratic element in society and the moderate men, for whom there was then no place in Indian politics, would range themselves on the side of the Government and oppose any further shifting of the balance of power and any attempt to democratise Indian institutions."

Lord Morley specifically disclaimed the remotest desire or intention of making these reforms a stepping-stone, directly or indirectly, to the establishment of a Parliamentary system in India, but they nevertheless did "constitute a forward step on the road leading at no distant period to a stage when the question of responsible government was bound to present itself." At first they were received with genuine satisfaction.

"But the reforms of 1909 afforded no answer, and could afford no answer, to Indian political problems. Narrow franchises and indirect elections failed to encourage in members a sense of responsibility to the people generally, and made it impossible, except in special constituencies, for those who had votes to use them with perception and effect. Moreover, the responsibility for the administration remain undivided: with the result that, while Governments found themselves far more exposed to questions and criticism than hitherto, questions and criticism were uninformed by a real sense of responsibility, such as comes from the prospect of having to assume office in turn. The conception of a responsible executive, wholly or partially amenable to the elected coun-

cils, was not admitted. Power remained with the Government and the councils were left with no functions but criticism. It followed that there was no reason to loose the bonds of official authority, which subjected local governments to the Government of India and the latter to the Secretary of State and Parliament. Such a situation, even if it had not been aggravated by external causes, might easily give rise to difficulties; the plan afforded no room for further advance along the same lines. Only one more thing remained to do, and that was to make the legislative and administrative acts of an irremovable executive entirely amenable to the elected councils; on which must have ensued the deadlock and disruption to which we refer elsewhere. The Morley-Minto reforms in our view are the final outcome of the old conception which made the Government of India a benevolent despotism (tempered by a remote and only occasionally vigilant democracy), which might as it saw fit for purposes of enlightenment consult the wishes of its subjects. To recur to Sir Bartle Frere's figure, the Government is still a monarch in *darbar*; but his councillors are uneasy, and not wholly content with his personal rule; and the administration in consequence has become slow and timid in operation. Parliamentary usages have been initiated and adopted in the councils up to the point where they cause the maximum of friction, but short of that at which by having a real sanction behind them they begin to do good. We have at present in India neither the best of the old system, nor the best of the new. Responsibility is the savour of popular government, and that savour the present councils wholly lack. We are agreed that our first object must be to invest them with it. They must have real work to do, and they must have real people to call them to account for their doing of it."

The whole of Chapter IV. is devoted to a close scrutiny of the working of the Morley-Minto Councils, the grave defects of the existing electoral system, the restricted franchise and mostly indirect elections which fail to establish any real connexion between the primary voter and the member who ultimately represents him; the predominance of the lawyer element, and the effect of the official *bloc* upon which Government relies for a mechanical majority, equally deadening to the nominated officials of whom it consists and irritating to the unofficial members who are always confronted with its disciplined vote. A fairly detailed analysis is given of the work actually performed by the councils, illustrating the influence which the Indian members have nevertheless exercised upon the administration as well as upon legislation, and the use they have made of their new rights to ask questions, to move resolutions, and to introduce private Bills.

"The councils were really more effective than they knew; but their triumphs were not won in broad daylight in the dramatic manner which political ardour desired. This was one reason why more interest was often shown in resolutions than in legislation. The carrying of a resolution against Government, apart from the opportunity of recording an opinion which might some day bear fruit, came to be regarded as a great moral victory: and it is evident that topics that are likely to combine all the Indian elements in the council offered the best opportunity. Because the centralisation of control limited the effectiveness of the

councils, the non-official members were driven to think more of display than they might have otherwise done ; and the sense of unreality on both sides deepened. All this time the national consciousness and the desire for political power were growing rapidly in the minds of educated Indians ; and the councils with their limited opportunities proved to be an insufficient safety-valve. While therefore inside the councils there are signs of hardening opposition and the weariness which comes of sterile efforts, outside the councils the tide of feeling was rising more quickly. For a short time after their inception the Morley-Minto reforms threatened to diminish the importance of the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League. It seemed as if the councils where elected members took a share in the business of Government must be a more effective instrument for political purposes than mere self-constituted gatherings. But with the disillusionment about the reformed councils, the popular conventions, where speakers were free to attack the Government and give vent to their own aspirations untrammelled by rules of business or the prospect of a reply, naturally regained their ascendancy ; and the line taken by prominent speakers in them has been to belittle the utility of the councils, if not to denounce them as a cynical and calculated sham."

Chapter V. contains an analysis of the relations between the Government of India and the Provincial Governments, from which it is argued that "the truly federal element does not and cannot enter into them." The importance and value of the "district" as the great unit of administration receives full recognition, and no less the part played by the Indian Civil Service.

"This executive organisation which we have described has been well likened to a nerve system of official posts, actuated up till now chiefly by impulses of its own, but affected by the popular ideas which impinge on it from three sources—the British Parliament, the legislative councils, and the local boards. Parliament can, of course, make its commands effective at any moment but rarely chooses to do so. The effect of the councils and local bodies in India has been to influence, but not yet to control, official working. The system has in the main depended for its effectiveness on the experience, wisdom, and energy of the services themselves. It has for the most part been represented by the Indian Civil Service, which, though having little to do with the technical departments of government, has for over one hundred years in practice had the administration entrusted to its hands, because with the exception of the offices of the Governor-General, Governors, and some members of the executive councils it has held practically all the places involving superior control. It has been in effect much more of a Government corporation than of a purely civil service in the English sense. It has been made a reproach to the Indian Civil Service that it regards itself as the Government ; but a view which strikes the critic familiar with parliamentary government as arrogant is little more than a condensed truth."

One of the most important chapters of the Report is that which deals with "The Conditions of the Problem." No attempt is made to under-rate the difficulties of introducing representative institutions into a

country where the political capacity of a vast rural population, amounting in British India to 226 out of 244 millions, is still almost entirely undeveloped, though its wants and its interests have a paramount claim to consideration and protection ; where illiteracy still prevails amongst the immense majority of the males and is almost universal amongst women, whilst the knowledge of English, which is the one great bond of unity amongst the educated classes, is confined to less than 2,000,000 people, where race and religion and social institutions have produced innumerable and profound lines of cleavage. Nevertheless, the leaven introduced with Western education cannot be ignored.

"The prospects of advance very greatly depend upon how far the educated Indian is in sympathy with and capable of fairly representing the illiterate masses. The old assumption that the interests of the ryot must be confided to official hands is strenuously denied by modern educated Indians. They claim that the European official must by his lack of instruction and comparative lack of skill in tongues be gravely handicapped in interpreting the thoughts and desires of an Asiatic people. On the other hand, it is argued that in the limited spread of education, the endurance of caste exclusiveness and of usages sanctioned by caste, and in the records of some local bodies and councils, may be found reasons which suggest that the politically-minded classes stand somewhat apart from and in advance of the ordinary life of the country. Nor would it be surprising if this were the case. Our educational policy in the past aimed at satisfying the few, who sought after English education, without sufficient thought of the consequences which might ensue from not taking care to extend instruction to the many. We have in fact created a limited *intelligentsia*, who desire advance ; and we cannot stay their progress entirely until education has been extended to the masses. It has been made a reproach to the educated classes that they have followed too exclusively after one or two pursuits, the law, journalism, or school teaching ; and that these are all callings which make men inclined to overrate the importance of words and phrases. But even if there is substance in the count, we must take note also how far the past policy of Government is responsible. We have not succeeded in making education practical. It is only now, when the war has revealed the importance of industry, that we have deliberately set about encouraging Indians to undertake the creation of wealth by industrial enterprise, and have thereby offered the educated classes any tangible inducement to overcome their traditional inclination to look down on practical forms of energy. We must admit that the educated Indian is a creation peculiarly of our own ; and if we take the credit that is due to us for his strong points we must admit a similar liability for his weak ones. Let us note also in justice to him that the progressive Indian appears to realise the narrow basis of his position and is beginning to broaden it. In municipal and university work he has taken a useful and creditable share. We find him organising effort not for political ends alone, but for various forms of public and social service. He has come forward and done valuable work in relieving famine and distress by floods, in keeping order at fairs, in helping pilgrims, and in promoting co-operative credit. Although his ventures in the fields of

commerce have not been always fortunate, he is beginning to turn his attention more to the improvement of agriculture and industry. Above all he is active in promoting education and sanitation ; and every increase in the number of educated people adds to his influence and authority."

It is not, however, at the bidding of any fraction, however large or however small, of the people of India that the policy embodied in the announcement of August 20 deserves to be accepted as "right and wise," and indeed as "the only possible policy for India."

" . . . Our reason is the faith that is in us. We have shown how step by step British policy in India has been steadily directed to a point at which the question of a self-governing India was bound to arise ; how impulses, at first faint, have been encouraged by education and opportunity ; how the growth quickened nine years ago, and was immeasurably accelerated by the war. We measure it not by the crowds at political meetings or the multiplication of newspapers ; but by the infallible signs that indicate the growth of character. We believe profoundly that the time has now come when the sheltered existence which we have given India cannot be prolonged without damage to her national life ; that we have a richer gift for her people than any that we have yet bestowed on them ; that nationhood within the Empire represents something better than anything India has hitherto attained ; that the placid, pathetic contentment of the masses is not the soil on which such Indian nationhood will grow, and that in deliberately disturbing it we are working for her highest good.

"If then our faith is right, what are the conditions of success ? Obviously there is much to change. The habits of generations have to be softened, if not overcome ; we have to call forth capacity and self-reliance in the place of helplessness ; nationhood in place of caste or communal feeling. But we have great influences working with us in the spirit of liberty that is stirring in Asia as in the rest of the world, and the intense desire of educated Indians to prove that their long period of tutelage may be ended and that they may take their place in the forefront of the world as a self-governing part of the Empire. The task is a great and worthy one, but it calls for some effort and self-sacrifice from every element in the community."

At the same time, the success of the experiment must largely depend upon the hearty co-operation of the Western educated classes ; and after quoting and endorsing an eloquent appeal addressed to them by the late Mr. Gokhale to throw their energies into the many-sided work of social as well as political education to be done throughout the country-side, the Report impresses upon them the very real and grave responsibility that rests upon them in another direction :—

"Together with this there is a very real responsibility of the utmost importance. There exists a small revolutionary party deluded by hatred of British rule and desire for the elimination of the Englishman into the belief that the path to independence or constitutional liberty lies through anarchical crime. Now it may be that such persons will see for themselves the wisdom of abandoning methods which are as futile as criminal ; though if they do not the powers of the law are or

can be made sufficient for the maintenance of order. But the existence of such people is a warning against the possible consequences of unrestrained agitation in India. We are justified in calling on the political leaders, in the work of education that they will undertake, to bear carefully in mind the political inexperience of their hearers; and to look for further progress not to fiery agitation, which may have consequences quite beyond their grasp, but to the machinery which we devise for the purpose. In every country there will be persons who love agitation for agitation's sake or to whom it appeals like an intoxicant. It is the duty of the leaders of Indian opinion to remember the effect on people, not accustomed to weighing words, of fiery and heated speeches. Where ignorance is widespread and passions are so easily aroused, nothing is easier than for political leaders to excite a storm; nothing harder for them than to allay it. Breaches of the peace or crimes of violence only put back the political clock. Above all things, when the future of India depends upon co-operation among all races, attacks upon one race or religion or upon another jeopardise the whole experiment. Nor can the condemnation of extremist and revolutionary action be left only to the official classes. We call upon all those who claim to be leaders to condemn with us and to support us in dealing with methods of agitation which drive schoolboys to crime and lead to religious and agrarian disturbance. Now that His Majesty's Government have declared their policy, reasonable men have something which they can oppose successfully to the excitement created by attacks on Government and by abuse of Englishmen, coupled with glowing and inaccurate accounts of India's golden past and appeals to race hatred in the name of religion. Many prominent Indians dislike and fear such methods. A new opportunity is now being offered to combat them; and we expect them to take it. Disorder must be prejudicial to the cause of progress and especially disorder as a political weapon. But we have no hesitation in recommending that the Government must maintain power to prevent the disastrous consequences if in any case law and order are jeopardised. Outbreaks of anarchy cannot be tolerated."

Part I. of the Report closes with a temperate and closely reasoned discussion of the solution propounded in the resolutions of the Congress and the Moslem League, which would merely reproduce in an aggregate form all the worst shortcomings of the Morley-Minto reforms. They are based on the utterly unsound conception that the Legislature and the Executive can derive their power from and be responsible to different authorities. A system conferring upon Indians negative power without responsibility would afford the worst possible education for responsible government. The safeguards suggested must prove illusory, and the scheme could only end in a deadlock, which some of its advocates seem "to look forward to producing as a means of bringing the Executive under the control of the Legislature"—a result which the scheme itself professes not to contemplate.

" . . . We have no desire to produce deadlocks. We have no wish to advance only by first making government impossible. On the contrary, we believe that the path of progress lies in another direction. We believe in the possibility of "smooth and harmonious progress" pursued

in a spirit of mutual goodwill and devotion to common interests. Our own proposals will show how we hope to start India on the road leading to responsible government with the prospect of winning her way to the ultimate goal, her progress hindered, it may be, at times by hills and rough places, but finding the road nowhere swept away by floods or landslides."

Part II., which embodies "The Proposals," starts with some "preliminary" observations on their purpose and scope :—

" . . . If our account of the past development and working of the present constitution is an accurate one, it will be apparent that we have now gone as far as is possible upon the old lines. No further development is possible unless we are going to give the people of India some responsibility for their own government. But no one can imagine that no further development is necessary. It is evident that the present machinery of government no longer meets the needs of the time ; it works slowly and it produces irritation ; there is a widespread demand on the part of educated Indian opinion for its alteration ; and the need for advance is recognised by official opinion also. . . . The inevitable result of education in the history and thought of Europe is the desire for self-determination ; and the demand that now meets us from the educated classes of India is no more than the right and natural outcome of the work of a hundred years. There can be no question of going back or of withholding the education and enlightenment in which we ourselves believe ; and yet the more we pursue our present course without at the same time providing the opportunities for the satisfaction of the desires which it creates, the more unpopular and difficult must our present government become and the worse must be the effect upon the mind of India. On the other hand, if we make it plain that, when we start on the new lines, education, capacity, and goodwill will have their reward in power, then we shall set the seal upon the work of past years. Unless we are right in going forward now the whole of our past policy in India has been a mistake. We believe, however, that no other policy was either right or possible, and therefore we must now face its logical consequences. Indians must be enabled, in so far as they attain responsibility, to determine for themselves what they want done. The process will begin in local affairs which we have long since intended and promised to make over to them ; the time has come for advance also in some subjects of provincial concern ; and it will proceed to the complete control of provincial matters and thence, in the course of time and subject to the proper discharge of Imperial responsibilities, to the control of matters concerning all India. We make it plain that such limitations on powers as we are now proposing are due only to the obvious fact that time is necessary in order to train both representatives and electorates for the work which we desire them to undertake ; and that we offer Indians opportunities at short intervals to prove the progress they are making and to make good their claim, not by the method of agitation, but by positive demonstration, to the further stages in self-government which we have just indicated.

^ "Further we have every reason to hope that as the result of this process India's connexion with the Empire will be confirmed by the wishes

of her people. The experience of a century of experiments within the Empire goes all in one direction. As power is given to the people of a province or of a Dominion to manage their own local affairs, their attachment becomes the stronger to the Empire which comprehends them all in a common bond of union. The existence of national feeling, or the love of and pride in a national culture, need not conflict with, and may indeed strengthen the sense of membership in a wider commonwealth."

A short survey of the problem of Indian education, so closely bound up with the development of political capacity, leads up to a statement of the broad principles upon which the proposals are based.

" . . . We have surveyed the existing position ; we have discussed the conditions of the problem ; and the goal to which we wish to move is clear. What course are we to set across the intervening space ? It follows from our premises, and it is also recognised in the announcement of August 20, that the steps are to be gradual and the advance tested at each stage. Consistently with these requirements a substantial step is to be taken at once. If our reasoning is sound, this can be done only by giving from the outset some measure of responsibility to representatives chosen by an electorate. There are obviously three levels at which it is possible to give it—in the sphere of local bodies, in the provinces, and in the Government of India. Of certain other levels which have been suggested, intermediate between the first and second of these, we shall speak in due course. Also, since no man can serve two masters, in proportion as control by an electorate is admitted at each level, control by superior authority must be simultaneously relaxed. If our plans are to be soundly laid, they must take account of actual conditions. It follows that the process cannot go on at one and the same pace on all levels. The Secretary of State's relaxation of control over the Government of India will be retarded, if for no other reason, by the paramount need for securing Imperial interests ; the Government of India have the fundamental duty to discharge of maintaining India's defence ; the basic obligation of provincial Governments is to secure law and order. As we go upwards, the importance of the retarding factors increases ; and it follows that popular growth must be more rapid and extensive in the lower levels than in the higher. Let us state the proposition in another way. The functions of government can be arranged in an ascending scale of urgency, ranging from those which concern the comfort and well-being of the individual to those which secure the existence of the State. The individual understands best the matters which concern him and of which he has experience ; and he is likely to handle best the things which he best understands. Our predecessors perceived this before us, and placed such matters to some extent under popular control. Our aim should be to bring them entirely under such control. This brings us to our first formula :—

" *' There should be, as far as possible, complete popular control in local bodies and the largest possible independence for them of outside control ' (1).*

" When we come to the provincial Governments the position is different. Our objective is the realisation of responsible government. We understand this to mean first, that the members of the executive Government should be responsible to, because capable of being changed

by, their constituents ; and secondly, that these constituents should exercise their power through the agency of their representatives in the assembly. These two conditions imply in their completeness that there exist constituencies based on a franchise broad enough to represent the interests of the general population, and capable of exercising an intelligent choice in the selection of their representatives ; and, secondarily, that it is recognised as the constitutional practice that the executive Government retains office only so long as it commands the support of a majority in the assembly. But in India these conditions are as yet wanting. The provincial areas and interests involved are immense, indeed are on what would elsewhere be regarded as a national scale. The amount of administrative experience available is small ; electoral experience is almost entirely lacking. There must be a period of political education, which can only be achieved through the gradual but expanding exercise of responsibility. The considerations of which we took account in Chapter VI. forbid us immediately to hand over complete responsibility. We must proceed therefore by transferring responsibility for certain functions of government while reserving control over others. From this starting-point we look for a steady approach to the transfer of complete responsibility. We may put our second formula thus :—

“ ‘ The provinces are the domain in which the earlier steps towards the progressive realisation of responsible government should be taken. Some measure of responsibility should be given at once, and our aim is to give complete responsibility as soon as conditions permit. This involves at once giving the provinces the largest measure of independence, legislative, administrative, and financial, of the government of India which is compatible with the due discharge by the latter of its own responsibilities ’ (2).

“ But, as we shall see, any attempt to establish equilibrium between the official and popular forces in government inevitably introduces additional complexity into the administration. For such hybrid arrangements precedents are wanting ; their working must be experimental, and will depend on factors that are yet largely unknown. We are not prepared, without experience of their results, to effect like changes in the Government of India. Nevertheless, it is desirable to make the Indian Legislative Council more truly representative of Indian opinion, and to give that opinion greater opportunities of acting on the Government. While, therefore, we cannot commend to Parliament a similar and simultaneous advance both in the provinces and in the Government of India, we are led to the following proposition :—

“ ‘ The Government of India must remain wholly responsible to Parliament, and, saving such responsibility, its authority in essential matters must remain indisputable, pending experience of the effect of the changes now to be introduced in the provinces. In the meantime the Indian Legislative Council should be enlarged and made more representative and its opportunities of influencing Government increased ’ (3). ”

Valid arguments are given for excluding for the present from the operation of the proposed scheme Burma, on the ground that whilst for military reasons it must remain part of the Indian polity and be represented in the Central Government, it is not India, and its peoples belong to another race and its problems are altogether different ; the North-West

Frontier Province and Baluchistan, for reasons of strategy ; certain smaller tracts, such as Delhi, Coorg, and Ajmer-Marwara, for local reasons ; and certain backward areas in different parts of British India, where the people are far too primitive to afford any material on which political institutions can be formed.

Chapter VIII. elaborates the "proposals" in the sphere in which the first big steps are to be taken towards the introduction of responsible government. It is difficult to summarise succinctly a scheme which in its nature is necessarily complicated and deals with many details of government and administration, for the most part unfamiliar to the British reader. It aims, in the first place, at securing a much larger measure of autonomy for the provinces, and for this purpose at introducing a complete separation of revenues between the provincial and Central Governments. With separate budgets and separate financial resources and certain powers of taxation, the provinces are also secured against any unnecessary interference in the spheres of legislative and administrative business. The way having thus been paved by a large measure of devolution to the provinces, the Provincial Executives are to be remodelled in such manner as to enable certain definite powers and responsibilities to be devolved upon Indian Ministers responsible to Indian electorates.

The Executive Government in a province will be composed of a Governor and an Executive Council, consisting of one European and one Indian member, Indian Ministers nominated by the Governor from the elected members of the Legislative Council, and an additional member or members without portfolios appointed by the Governor from amongst his senior officials for purposes of consultation and advice only.

The essential feature of this reconstruction of the Provincial Executive is the devolution of power and responsibility on to Indian Ministers in regard to a group of subjects, described as "transferred subjects," which it is left to a special committee to define after careful inquiry and consultation, though it is tentatively suggested in an appendix that they might include taxation for provincial purposes ; local self-government, rural and urban ; education, primary, secondary, and technical ; sanitation, excise, minor public works, etc. In regard to these subjects, the Indian Ministers are to be responsible to an enlarged Legislative Council, with a substantial elected majority and a minority consisting of nominated members, who may be officials or non-officials and of *ex-officio* members. The franchise, to be determined by a Committee chosen *ad hoc*, is to be made as broad as possible, election is to be direct, and communal representation, though deprecated in principle as calculated to perpetuate the existing lines of cleavage between different communities, and to hinder the development of self-government, is to be maintained for the present on grounds of policy for the protection of Mahomedan and, if necessary, other minorities.

The Report faces the difficulty of preserving the necessary unity in a Government divided into branches with separate functions and different responsibilities, for whilst the Indian Ministers will be responsible to an Indian electorate for the exercise of the specific powers devolved upon them, the Governor-in-Council, who will remain in charge of all the

“reserved” subjects—*i.e.*, of all subjects not specifically “transferred”—will continue to be responsible, as at present, to the Government of India and the Secretary of State.

“It is our intention that the Government thus composed and with this distribution of functions shall discharge them as one Government. It is highly desirable that the executive should cultivate the habit of associated deliberation, and essential that it should present a united front to the outside. We would therefore suggest that, as a general rule, it should deliberate as a whole, but there must certainly be occasions upon which the Governor will prefer to discuss a particular question with that part of his Government directly responsible. It would therefore rest with him to decide, whether to call a meeting of his whole Government or of either part of it, though he would doubtless pay special attention to the advice of the particular member or minister in charge of the subjects under discussion. The actual decision on a transferred subject would be taken, after general discussion, by the Governor and his Ministers; the action to be taken on a reserved subject would be taken, after similar discussion, by the Governor and the other members of his Executive Council, who would arrive at their decision in the manner provided in the existing statute. The additional members, if present, would take their share in the discussion, but would in no case take a part in the decision. At a meeting of the whole Government there would never be, in fact, any question of voting, for the decision would be left, as we have stated, to that part of the Government responsible for the particular subject involved. But there are questions upon which the functions of the two portions of the Government will touch or overlap, such for instance as decisions on the Budget or on many matters of administration. On these questions, in case of a difference of opinion between the Ministers and the Executive Council it will be the Governor who decides.

“Let us now see the advantages of this transitional arrangement and anticipate criticisms. It has been urged with great force that, at the outset, it would be unfair to entrust the responsibility for the administration of any subject to men holding office at the will of the Legislative Council. The Legislative Council has had no experience of the power of dismissing Ministers, or the results attending the exercise of such power. Nobody in India is yet familiar with the obligations imposed by tenure of office at the will of a representative assembly. It is only by actual experience that these lessons can be learned. But our scheme provides security of tenure for Ministers for the lifetime of the Council during the preliminary period, and therefore gives some time, which we think should be short, to prepare for the full exercise of responsibility. By the device, however, of appointing the Ministers from the elected members of the Legislative Council and making their tenure of office conditional on the retention of their seats we have established at once some measure of responsibility, in the form of responsibility to their constituents, and have thus put an end to the condition of affairs in which those entrusted with the administration are wholly irresponsible to the constituents who elect the Legislative Council. By dividing the Government into what will in effect be two committees with different

responsibilities we have ensured that members of the Government accountable to different authorities do not exercise the same responsibility for all subjects. By entrusting the transferred portfolios to the ministers we have limited responsibility to the Indian electorate to those subjects in which we desire to give responsibility first. We have done this without now or at any time depriving the Indian element in the Government of responsibility for the reserved subjects. . . . It is quite true that our plan involves some weakening of the unity of the executive and some departure from constitutional orthodoxy ; but whenever and wherever we approach this problem of realising responsibility at different times in different functions, we find it impossible to adhere tightly to theoretical principles. It would be impossible to attain our object by a composite Government so composed that all its members should be equally responsible for all subjects. At the same time it is necessary to secure that the whole executive should be capable of acting together. What we can do is to aim at minimising causes of friction ; and we have proposed arrangements that can be worked by mutual forbearance and a strong common purpose. It is our intention that the decisions of the Government should be loyally defended by the entire Government, but that the Ministers should feel responsibility for conforming to the wishes of their constituents. It is true that these two forces may pull different ways ; but though the analogy is clearly not complete, there are occasions when members of a Government, and indeed members of Parliament at home, have to choose between loyalty to the Government and to their own constituents. All the members of the composite executive will be chosen by the Governor, and his position in the administration will enable him to act as a strong unifying force. The habit of deliberating as a whole will also tend to preserve the unity of the Government, while the special responsibility of either part for the subjects committed to it will be recognised by the Legislative Council and the electorate. It seems to us, therefore, that both from the point of view of capacity for development and from that of ensuring co-operation while developing responsibility our arrangement is the best that can be devised for the transitional period."

The Report lays down the general principles on which they contemplate the separation between "reserved" and "transferred" subjects:—

"The committee's first business will be to consider what are the services to be appropriated to the provinces, all others remaining with the Government of India. We suggest that it will find that some matters are of wholly provincial concern, and that others are primarily provincial but that in respect of them some statutory restrictions upon the discretion of provincial Governments may be necessary. Other matters again may be provincial in character so far as administration goes, while there may be good reasons for keeping the right of legislation in respect of them in the hands of the Government of India. The list so compiled will define the corpus of material to which our scheme is to be applied. In the second place the committee will consider which of the provincial subjects should be transferred ; and what limitations must be placed upon the Ministers' complete control of them. Their guiding principle should be to include in the transferred list those departments

which afford most opportunity for local knowledge and social service, those in which Indians have shown themselves to be keenly interested, those in which mistakes which may occur though serious would not be irremediable, and those which stand most in need of development. In pursuance of this principle we should not expect to find that departments primarily concerned with the maintenance of law and order were transferred. Nor should we expect the transfer of matters which vitally affect the well-being of the masses who may not be adequately represented in the new councils, such for example as questions of land revenue or tenant rights."

But, whatever the line of demarcation, the final authority of Government must be safeguarded.

"Further, inasmuch as administration is a living business and its corpus cannot be dissected with the precision of an autopsy, we must, even in the case of matters ordinarily made over to non-official control, secure the right of re-entry either to the official executive Government of the province, or to the Government of India in cases where their interests are essentially affected. For instance, the central Government must have the power, for reasons which will be readily apparent in every case, of intervening effectively, whether by legislation or administrative action, in matters such as those affecting defence, or foreign or political relations, or foreign trade, or the tariff; or which give rise to questions affecting the interests of more than one province; or which concern the interests of all-India services even if serving under provincial Governments. Similarly the Governor in Executive Council must have power to intervene with full effect in matters which concern law and order, or which raise religious or racial issues, or to protect the interests of existing services."

Provision is made for securing to Government the affirmative power of legislation in the Provincial Council by the institution of a Grand Committee, to which measures certificated by the Governor as essential to the discharge of his paramount responsibilities shall be referred. To this Grand Committee the Governor shall have power to nominate a bare majority, exclusive of himself. Whilst recognising the danger of friction if the allocation of revenue as between "reserved" and transferred subjects is left open for annual discussion with the Budget, the Report rejects the alternative proposal for a periodical settlement.

The scheme being altogether experimental, the Report recommends that the Government of India shall conduct an inquiry into its operation after a first period of five years, with a view to extending or restricting the powers of the Indian Ministers in accordance with results, whilst Parliament should appoint periodic commissions at intervals of, say, twelve years to review the working of the new system as a whole, and to consider all important matters germane to its main purpose—namely, the advancement of India towards responsible government. This, it is argued, would be a very desirable reversion to a practice unfortunately abandoned after the transfer of the Government of India to the Crown. One of the most important matters for investigation by such commissions would be the growth of capacity and responsibility in the electorates.

“ . . . The approximation to complete responsibility must depend among other things on the growth of the electorate and on the measure in which they give evidence of an active and intelligent use of the franchise. We wish to attain complete responsibility where we can and as early as we can, and we intend that its attainment should depend upon the efforts of the Indian people themselves. It would not be fair to give it to them till they fulfil the necessary conditions.”

The Legislatures of the future are to be constituted as follows :—

“ . . . We propose there shall be in each province an enlarged Legislative Council, differing in size and composition from province to province, with a substantial elected majority, elected by direct election on a broad franchise, with such communal and special representation as may be necessary. This brief epitome of our proposals needs some amplification if it is to be intelligible. We have been invited by many advisers to indicate at once the composition of the councils which we contemplate. We have refrained from that task for good and sufficient reasons. It would be easy to make proposals, but in the present state of our information it would be very difficult to invest those proposals with authority. If a sound beginning is to be made the foundations for the building must be laid deeper. The first step must be not a hard and fast adjustment of the compositions of the councils to the various interests of each province as estimated from headquarters, but a careful survey of all the material available in the province for an electorate. We must in fact measure the number of persons who can in the different parts of the country be reasonably entrusted with the duties of citizenship. We must ascertain what sort of franchise will be suited to local conditions, and how interests that may be unable to find adequate representation in such constituencies are to be represented. Such an electoral survey of the entire country is obviously beyond our powers at the present time. We propose that the work should be undertaken by a special committee, which should be appointed to deal with it as soon as possible : for whatever modifications of our own proposals may be decided upon in further discussion it seems to us certain that work of this particular nature must in any case be done. We suggest that the committee should consist of a chairman chosen from outside India, two experienced officials, and two Indians of high standing and repute. In each province the material for its deliberations would, of course, be prepared for it by the local Government : indeed some spadework has already been done. As the committee visited each province in turn one civilian officer and one Indian appointed by the provincial Government should join it and share in its labours. The committee's investigations into the subjects of the franchise, the constituencies, and the nominated element, to which we refer below, will enable it to advise as to the composition of the councils, which, we propose, should then be determined by the Secretary of State in Council, on the recommendation of the Government of India, in the form of regulations to be laid before Parliament. We think this is certainly a better method than to formulate such matters in the statute itself. All the electoral architecture must inevitably be experimental and will need modification and development from time to time.”

Chapter IX., whilst maintaining intact the supremacy of the Government of India, contemplates, nevertheless, important changes, of which the most notable is the substitution for the Viceroy's Legislative Council of two Chambers, the one a Council of State, partly elected and partly nominated, with an official majority, the other to be called the Indian Legislative Assembly, to consist of about 100 members, of whom two-thirds are to be elected and one-third nominated. Another Indian member is to be added to the Viceroy's Executive Council, and the existing statutory restrictions on its composition should be repealed. The Council of State will be "the supreme legislative authority for India on all crucial questions and also the revising authority upon all Indian legislation." An Indian Privy Council is to be created "as a means of honouring and employing ripe wisdom or meritorious service."

Simultaneously the Secretary of State, with the consent of Parliament, must renounce some of the control he now exercises, particularly in regard to the "transferred subjects," for which the new Indian provincial authorities will be responsible. This, again, involves certain alterations in the functions of the India Office and the constitution of the India Council. Inspired by the desire to make at the same time such control as Parliament must for the present continue to exercise over Indian affairs more effective and intelligent than it has of late years become, the Report advises that the Secretary of State's salary, like that of all other Ministers of the Crown, shall be defrayed from home revenues and voted annually by Parliament, and that the House of Commons be asked to appoint a Select Committee on Indian Affairs at the beginning of each Session.

Chapter X. contains some tentative proposals for drawing closer the relations between the Native States and British India by the creation of a Council of Princes which the Viceroy could occasionally invite to joint deliberation and discussion with the Council of State, and whose members might also be induced to serve on committees of the Indian Privy Council.

Chapter XI. deals with a variety of subjects which, though classified as "Miscellaneous," are all of high importance. It contains suggestions for increasing the Indian element in the Public Services on lines similar to, but extending beyond, the recommendations of the Public Services Commission, whilst recognising also the necessity of maintaining and protecting a strong European element, which will have new opportunities of usefulness, more arduous in some respects but perhaps even more vital than in the past. Our policy with regard to the Indian Army stands also in need of revision, both as to a more generous recognition of military services and the granting of British commissions to qualified Indians.

With regard to the development of Indian industries and commerce, the Report contains a brief review of Indian activities and of opinions on fiscal questions and a forecast of the recommendations of the Industrial Commission appointed during the war, but confines itself to the proposition that here also there must be a definite change of view and that Government must admit and shoulder its responsibilities. Attention is also called to the position and duties of the European non-official

communities whether engaged in business or in missionary work, to our own special obligations in connexion with the large Anglo-Indian or Eurasian community of mixed descent, and to the delicate and difficult problem of social relations between Indians and Europeans, which newspapers on both sides "have it in their power greatly to improve."

The "Conclusions," in which the Viceroy and the Secretary of State sum up the results of their labours, contain a warm expression of thanks for the assistance they everywhere received.

"... From official and non-official alike of all races we found acceptance of the announcement upon which our work was based, and a whole-hearted desire to assist us in carrying it out. It is difficult where we have received so much help to particularise, but we would pay our special thanks to the Government of India and the local Governments; to the Earl of Donoughmore, Sir William Duke, Mr. Basu, Mr. Charles Roberts, M.P., and Mr. Seton, who were associated with the Secretary of State; to Sir William Vincent, who for some months was placed on special duty to assist him. All of these played an invaluable part in the elaboration of our proposals. Our special thanks are also due to Mr. Marris, who has earned our warm appreciation and gratitude by the valuable services which he has rendered, especially by assisting us in the task of drafting this report."

The Report closes, as it begins, on a solemn note:—

"We have only one more word to say. If anything could enhance the sense of responsibility under which our recommendations are made in a matter fraught with consequences so immense, it would be the knowledge that even as we bring our Report to an end far greater issues still hang in the balance upon the battle-fields of France. It is there and not in Delhi or Whitehall that the ultimate decision of India's future will be taken. The liberty of the world must be won before our deliberations over the liberalising of Indian political institutions can acquire any tangible meaning. We cannot close this document more fittingly than with the prayer, which we know all India echoes, that the principles of justice and freedom may be saved to the world by the splendid endurance and self-sacrifice of his Majesty's and the Allied Armies."

Attached to the Report are three supplementary papers expressing the general assent of Mr. Montagu's colleagues in his inquiry (Lord Donoughmore, Sir William Duke, Mr. B. N. Basu, and Mr. Charles Roberts), the Government of India, and the Council of India, with reservations in the case of the two latter as to details of the scheme, though they support its general policy.

DESPATCH FROM FIELD-MARSHAL SIR DOUGLAS HAIG, K.T.,
G.C.B., G.C.V.O., DESCRIBING THE RETREAT IN MARCH.
(PUBLISHED OCTOBER 22.)

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS, *July 20, 1918.*

MY LORD,

I have the honour to submit the following Report upon the operations of the Forces under my Command during the period following the actions in the vicinity of Cambrai in the first week of December, 1917:—

(1) The broad facts of the change which took place in the general war situation at the close of 1917, and the causes which led to it, have long been well known and need be referred to but shortly.

The disappearance of Russia as a belligerent country on the side of the Entente Powers had set free the great bulk of the German and Austrian divisions on the Eastern Front. Already at the beginning of November, 1917, the transfer of German divisions from the Russian to the Western Front had begun. It became certain that the movement would be continued steadily until numerical superiority lay with the enemy.

It was to be expected, moreover, that large numbers of guns and munitions formerly in the possession of the Russian Armies would fall into the hands of our enemies, and at some future date would be turned against the Allies.

Although the growing Army of the United States of America might be expected eventually to restore the balance in our favour, a considerable period of time would be required to enable that Army to develop its full strength. While it would be possible for Germany to complete her new dispositions early in the new year, the forces which America could send to France before the season would permit active operations to be recommenced would not be large.

(2) In view of the situation described above, it became necessary to change the policy governing the conduct of the operations of the British Armies in France. Orders accordingly were issued early in December having for their object immediate preparation to meet a strong and sustained hostile offensive. In other words, a defensive policy was adopted, and all necessary arrangements consequent thereon were put in hand with the least possible delay.

(3) Since the month of September, 1917, pursuant to a decision taken by the British Government towards the end of that month, negotiations had been proceeding with the French authorities regarding the extension of the front held by the British Armies. After considerable discussion on the subject, it was finally decided that the British should relieve the French troops on my right as far as the vicinity of the village of Barisis, immediately south of the River Oise. The additional front to be taken over by me amounted to over 28 miles.

This relief, which was to have taken place in December, was delayed until January in consequence of the further development of the Cambrai battle. In the meantime, the French forces which had co-operated so successfully on the left of the British in Flanders had been withdrawn, and French troops again assumed responsibility for the coastal sector at Nieuport.

By the end of January, 1918, the relief of the French as far as Barisis had been completed without incident. At that date the British Armies were holding some 125 miles of active front.

(4) The strenuous efforts made by the British forces during 1917 had left the Army at a low ebb in regard both to training and numbers. It was therefore of the first importance, in view of the expected German offensive, to fill up the ranks as rapidly as possible and provide ample facilities for training.

So far as the second of these requirements was concerned, two factors materially affected the situation. First, training had hitherto been primarily devoted to preparation for offensive operations. Secondly, the necessity for maintaining the front-line systems of defence and the construction of new lines on ground recently captured from the enemy had precluded the development of rear-line systems to any great degree.

Under the new conditions the early construction of these latter systems, involving the employment of every available man on the work, became a matter of vital importance. In consequence, it was difficult to carry out any elaborate course of training in defensive tactics. On the other hand, in the course of the strenuous fighting in 1916 and 1917 great developments had taken place in the methods of conducting a defensive battle. It was essential that the lessons learned therein should be assimilated rapidly and thoroughly by all ranks.

At the same time a change took place in the organisation of the forces. Under instructions from the Army Council, the reorganisation of divisions from a 13-battalion to a 10-battalion basis was completed during the month of February. Apart from the reduction in fighting strength involved by this reorganisation, the fighting efficiency of units was to some extent affected. An unfamiliar grouping of units was introduced thereby, necessitating new methods of tactical handling of the troops and the discarding of old methods to which subordinate commanders had been accustomed.

The difficulties with which we were faced were accentuated by the increase in the British front described in the preceding paragraph. Meanwhile, in marked contrast to our own position, the large reserves in the Western theatre, which the enemy was able to create for himself by the transfer of numerous divisions from the East, enabled him to carry out extensive training with units completed to establishment.

(5) Orders issued early in December, as stated above, had defined the defensive policy to be adopted and the methods of defence. A vast amount of work was required to be done in the construction of defences, old systems had to be remodelled, and new systems created. The construction of new communications and the extension of old, more especially in the area south-east of Arras which the enemy had devastated in his retirement last year, involved the building of a number of additional roads and the laying out of railways, both narrow and normal gauge. Work of this nature was particularly necessary on the Somme battle-field and in the area recently taken over from the French.

All available men of the fighting units, with the exception of a very small proportion undergoing training, and all labour units were employed on these tasks. Though the time and labour available were in no way adequate if, as was suspected, the enemy intended to commence his offensive operations in the early spring, a large portion of the work was in fact completed before the enemy launched his great attack. That so much was accomplished is due to the untiring energy of all ranks of the fighting units, the Transportation Service, and the Labour Corps.

(6) In addition to our own defensive schemes, completion of arrangements for the closest possible co-operation with the French was recognised to be a matter of great importance and urgency. A comprehensive

investigation was undertaken into the various problems connected with the co-operations of the two Allied forces. Plans were drawn up in combination with the French military authorities, and were worked out in great detail to meet the different situations which might arise on different parts of the Allied front. Measures were taken to ensure the smooth and rapid execution of these plans.

Among the many problems studied by the Allied Staffs, those involved by a hostile offensive on the line of the Somme River and the passage of that river by the enemy had been worked out. The plans applicable to such a situation had been drawn up and were ready to be put into execution when required.

(7) In order to ensure the greatest possible concentration of effort upon training, reorganisation, and defences, and also in order to allow my divisions the maximum amount of rest after the continuous fighting of 1917, only such minor enterprises were undertaken by the British forces during the winter months as were essential to keep us informed regarding the dispositions and intentions of the German forces opposed to us. Special attention was directed to disposing our forces in line in such manner as would best promote economy in men and reduce casualties.

On the enemy's side some little activity continued until the end of the year, and local attacks were made by him both on the Cambrai front and in the Ypres sector, resulting in certain small modifications in the line held by us. In these engagements the policy followed by me was to avoid involving troops in struggles for non-essential positions, and subordinate commanders were instructed accordingly.

The first of the enemy's minor attacks took place on December 12 in the neighbourhood of Bullecourt, and after sharp fighting led to the loss of the point of the salient held by us east of that village, with a consequent shortening of our line. Other local attacks on December 14 and 22 at Polderhoek Château and astride the Ypres-Staden Railway also resulted in small and unimportant withdrawals of portions of our outpost line in these localities.

On December 30 a somewhat more serious attempt was made by the enemy against our positions on Welsh Ridge, on the Cambrai front. The attack, made in the early morning on a front of over two miles from La Vacquerie northwards towards Marcoing, was delivered in considerable strength, and elaborate precautions were taken by the enemy to effect surprise. South of Marcoing, the enemy gained possession of a somewhat isolated trench sited on the northern slopes of Welsh Ridge, compelling our troops to fall back to a sunken road lying across the base of the salient, where they organised a successful resistance. At the southern end of the ridge near La Vacquerie the enemy's attack succeeded in overrunning not only our forward posts but also the trench line on the crest of the ridge, with all its advantages of observation. During the afternoon, however, an admirably executed counter-attack by two companies of the 63rd Division drove the enemy from the crest of the ridge and regained all the essential parts of our former positions.

On January 5, and again on the 8th, the enemy made two other local attacks east of Bullecourt, both of which were unsuccessful.

Early in March there was a recrudescence of hostile activity in the

northern sector. Following upon an unsuccessful attack on the Belgian advanced positions north of Dixmude on March 6, two local attacks were made by the enemy two days later on the British front, the one south and north of the Menin Road, and the other, on a front of over a mile, south of Houthulst Forest. Both these attacks were repulsed after sharp fighting and our line maintained or re-established by counter-attacks.

During the whole of this period hostile raiding parties displayed greatly increased activity, but the vigilance of our troops prevented them from achieving any success in more than a small proportion of instances. On our side, during the earlier part of the winter, raiding activity was deliberately cut down to the lowest limits consonant with the maintenance of an adequate knowledge of the enemy's dispositions. In the three and a half months extending from the morning of December 8, 1917, to the opening of the German offensive, some 225 raids were attempted by the enemy. Not more than 62 of these were successful in obtaining any identification from our lines, while in 67 cases his raiding parties left prisoners or dead in our hands. During the same period some 125 raids were carried out by us, 77 of which were successful in obtaining prisoners or identifications, while in 31 other cases the enemy's trenches were found to have been evacuated.

Besides raids, considerable patrolling activity took place on both sides. In this form of warfare our troops maintained a marked superiority over the enemy on almost all occasions and secured many prisoners, in addition to inflicting frequent casualties on hostile patrols and working parties.

(8) Towards the middle of February, 1918, it became evident that the enemy was preparing for a big offensive on the Western Front. It was known from various sources that he had been steadily increasing his forces in the Western theatre since the beginning of November, 1917. In three and a half months twenty-eight infantry divisions had been transferred from the Eastern theatre and six infantry divisions from the Italian theatre. There were reports that further reinforcements were on their way to the West, and it was also known that the enemy had greatly increased his heavy artillery in the Western theatre during the same period. These reinforcements were more than were necessary for defence, and, as they were moved at a time when the distribution of food and fuel to the civil population in Germany was rendered extremely difficult through lack of rolling stock, I concluded that the enemy intended to attack at an early date.

Constant air reconnaissances over the enemy's lines showed that rail and road communications were being improved and ammunition and supply dumps increased along the whole front from Flanders to the Oise. By the end of February, 1918, these preparations had become very marked opposite the front held by the Third and Fifth British Armies, and I considered it probable that the enemy would make his initial effort from the Sensée River southwards. As March 21 approached it became certain that an attack on this sector was imminent, and counter-preparation was carried out nightly by our artillery on the threatened front. By March 21 the number of German infantry divisions in the Western theatre had risen to 192, an increase of forty-six since November 1, 1917.

(9) In making the necessary distribution of the forces under my command to meet the threatened German attack, the enemy's possible objectives and the relative importance of ground in the various sectors had to be taken into consideration. These objectives and their bearing on the distribution of the troops are set forth below :—

(i) In the northern portion of the British area lie the northern Channel ports of Dunkirk, Calais, and Boulogne, the security of which necessitated the maintenance of sufficient troops in the neighbourhood. Little or no ground could be given up on this front, and therefore the necessary reserves must be kept in close proximity.

Although, as a rule, the state of the ground would preclude a general offensive in this sector early in the year, the weather had been exceptionally dry, and preparations for an attack by the enemy astride the Menin Road were known to be in an advanced state.

(ii) In the central portion lie the northern collieries of France and certain important tactical features which cover our lateral communications.

Here also little or no ground could be given up, except in the Lys Valley itself.

(iii) In the southern portion of the British area south-east of Arras, in contrast to the central and northern portions, ground could be given up under great pressure without serious consequences, the forward area of this sector consisting chiefly of a wide expanse of territory devastated by the enemy last spring in his withdrawal.

As shown in paragraph (8) it was evident that the enemy was about to make a great effort south of Arras. An attack on this front would undoubtedly have as its object the separation of the French and British armies and the capture of the important centre of communications of Amiens. To meet this eventuality more than half my available troops were allocated to the defence of this sector, together with the whole of the cavalry. In addition, as previously stated, arrangements had been made for the movement of a French force to the southern portion of the British area north of the River Oise in case of need.

(iv) Arrangements were made in detail for the rapid transport by rail or bus of a force of such British divisions as could be held back in reserve to meet any emergency on any sector of the British front.

(10) On March 19 my Intelligence Department reported that the final stages of the enemy's preparations on the Arras-St. Quentin front were approaching completion, and that from information obtained it was probable that the actual attack would be launched on March 20 or 21. On our side our dispositions to meet the expected offensive were as complete as the time and troops available could make them.

The front of the Fifth Army, at that date commanded by General Sir H. de la P. Gough, K.C.B., K.C.V.O., extended from our junction with the French just south of Barisis to north of Gouzeaucourt, a distance of about 42 miles, and was held by the III., XVIII, XIX., and VII. Corps, commanded respectively by Lieut.-General Sir R. H. K. Butler, K.C.M.G., C.B., Lieut.-General Sir I. Maxse, K.C.B., C.V.O., D.S.O., Lieut.-General Sir H. E. Watts, K.C.B., C.M.G., and Lieut.-General Sir W. N. Congreve, V.C., K.C.B., M.V.O. Over 10 miles of this front between Amigny-Rouy

and Alaincourt were protected by the marshes of the Oise River and Canal, and were therefore held more lightly than the remainder of the line ; but on the whole front of this Army the number of divisions in line only allowed of an average of one division to some 6,750 yards of front.

The Third Army, under the command of General the Hon. Sir J. H. G. Byng, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., M.V.O., held a front of about 27 miles from north of Gouzeaucourt to south of Gavrelle with the V., IV., VI., and XVII. Corps, under the respective commands of Lieut.-General Sir E. A. Fanshawe, K.C.B., Lieut.-General Sir G. M. Harper, K.C.B., D.S.O., Lieut.-General Sir J. A. L. Haldane, K.C.B., D.S.O., and Lieut.-General Sir C. Fergusson, Bt., K.C.B., K.C.M.G., M.V.O., D.S.O. The average length of front held by each division in line on the Third Army front was about 4,700 yards.

The general principle of our defensive arrangements on the fronts of these Armies was the distribution of our troops in depth. With this object three defensive belts, sited at considerable distances from each other, had been constructed or were approaching completion in the forward area, the most advanced of which was in the nature of a lightly held outpost screen covering our main positions. On the morning of the attack the troops detailed to man these various defences were all in position.

Behind the forward defences of the Fifth Army, and in view of the smaller resources which could be placed at the disposal of that Army, arrangements had been made for the construction of a strong and carefully sited bridgehead position covering Péronne and the crossings of the River Somme south of that town. Considerable progress had been made in the laying out of this position, though at the outbreak of the enemy offensive its defences were incomplete.

(11) From the information at my disposal, it was expected that the enemy's heaviest attack would fall between the Sensée River and the Bapaume-Cambrai road, and on this front of some 16,000 yards eighteen German divisions are known to have been employed in line and in immediate reserve on March 21. It was correctly anticipated that the Flesquières salient itself would not be directly attacked in strength, but that the attack would be continued in great force from the southern flank of the salient to St. Quentin. On this front of some 48,000 yards, from Gouzeaucourt to the Oise River at Moy, forty German divisions were set in motion on the first day.

An event which, having regard to the nature of the ground, was not considered probable, was that the enemy would be able to extend the flank of his attack in any considerable strength beyond Moy. The rapid drying of the marshes, due to an exceptionally dry spring, in fact enabled the enemy to attack this lightly held front with three fresh divisions, in addition to the three divisions already in line.

(12) In all at least sixty-four German divisions took part in the operations of the first day of the battle, a number considerably exceeding the total forces composing the entire British Army in France. The majority of these divisions had spent many weeks and even months in concentrated training for offensive operations, and had reached a high pitch of technical excellence in the attack.

To meet this assault the Third Army disposed of eight divisions in line on the front of the enemy's initial attack, with seven divisions available in reserve. The Fifth Army disposed of fourteen divisions and three cavalry divisions, of which three infantry divisions and three cavalry divisions were in reserve. The total British force on the original battle front, therefore, on the morning of March 21 was twenty-nine infantry divisions and three cavalry divisions, of which nineteen infantry divisions were in line.

Launched on a front of about 54 miles on March 21, the area of the German offensive spread northwards on March 28, until from La Fère to beyond Gavrelle some 63 miles of our former line were involved. On this front a total of seventy-three German divisions were engaged during March against the Third and Fifth Armies and the right of the First Army, and were opposed in the first place by twenty-two British infantry divisions in line, with twelve infantry divisions and three cavalry divisions in close reserve.

As soon as it became evident that the enemy had thrown practically the whole of his striking force against this one battle front, it became both possible and necessary to collect additional reserves from the remainder of my front, and hurry them to the battle-field. Plans previously drawn up to meet such an eventuality were put into execution at once, and before the end of March, by which date the principal German effort had been broken, a further force of eight British divisions was brought south and sent into the fight. Prior to April 9 four other British divisions were engaged, making a total of forty-six British infantry divisions and three cavalry divisions employed on the Somme battle front.

(13) Shortly before 5 A.M. on March 21 a bombardment of great intensity, with gas and high explosive shell from all natures of artillery and trench mortars, was opened against practically the whole fronts of the Fifth and Third Armies from the Oise to the Scarpe River, while road centres and railways as far back as St. Pol were engaged by high velocity guns. Violent bombardments were opened also on the French front in wide sectors east and north-east of Reims, and on portions of the British front between the Scarpe River and Lens. Our positions from south of the La Bassée Canal to the River Lys were heavily shelled with gas, and battery areas between Messines and the Ypres-Comines Canal were actively engaged. Dunkirk was bombarded from the sea.

The hour of the enemy's assault varied in different sectors, but by about 9.45 A.M. a general attack had been launched on a battle front of 54 miles between the Oise and the Sensée Rivers. Later in the day, as visibility improved, large numbers of low-flying aeroplanes attacked our troops and batteries.

Favoured by a thick white fog, which hid from our artillery and machine gunners the S.O.S. signals sent up by our outpost line, and in numbers which made loss of direction impossible, the attacking German infantry forced their way into our foremost defensive zone. Until 1 P.M. the fog made it impossible to see more than 50 yards in any direction, and the machine-guns and forward field guns which had been disposed so as to cover this zone with their fire were robbed almost entirely of

their effect. The detachments holding the outpost positions were consequently overwhelmed or surrounded, in many cases before they were able to pass back information concerning the enemy's attack.

The attack being expected, reserves had been brought forward and battle stations manned. On all parts of the battle front garrisons of redoubts and strong points in the forward zone held out with the utmost gallantry for many hours. From some of them wireless messages were received up to a late hour in the day, giving information of much value. The losses which they were able to inflict upon the enemy were undoubtedly very great and materially delayed his advance. The prolonged defence of these different localities, under conditions which left little hope of any relief, deserves to rank among the most heroic actions in the history of the British Army.

So intense was the enemy's bombardment that at an early hour our communications were severed, and so swift was his advance under the covering blanket of the mist that certain of our more advanced batteries found the German infantry close upon them before they had received warning from their own infantry that the expected attack had been launched. Many gallant deeds were performed by the personnel of such batteries, and on numerous occasions heavy losses were inflicted on bodies of hostile troops by guns firing over open sights at point-blank range.

(14) During the morning reports were received that the enemy had penetrated our front line opposite La Fère, and had also broken into our forward positions north of the Bapaume-Cambrai road, and opposite Lagnicourt and Bullecourt. The first indication that the progress made by him was developing a serious aspect was the news that at noon German infantry were entering Ronssoy. This meant that in this sector the attack had already reached and penetrated a considerable distance into the second defensive belt which constituted our battle positions.

The enemy's success at this point was followed up vigorously. Templeux-le-Guérard fell into his hands shortly afterwards, while the villages of Hargicourt and Villeret, attacked simultaneously in flank and rear, were practically surrounded, and were entered about midday.

Thereafter the enemy was held up by the resistance of our troops in the rear defences of the battle zone, greatly assisted by the very gallant action of the 24th Division in Le Verguier and the 21st Division at Epehy, on the two flanks of his advance. Both these divisions, under command respectively of Major-General A. C. Daly, C.B., and Major-General D. G. M. Campbell, C.B., held out throughout the day against repeated attacks delivered in great strength, and killed large numbers of the enemy. In this fighting parties of German troops who had entered Peizière on the northern outskirts of Epehy were driven out by our infantry, with the assistance of tanks, which on this and many subsequent occasions did valuable and gallant work.

(15) At midday the enemy's infantry had reached the first line of our battle positions in strength on practically the whole front of his attack, except at the Flesquières salient, where his assaults were not pressed with the same weight as elsewhere. Save in the neighbourhood of Ronssoy, however, and at certain other points in a less serious degree, our battle positions themselves had not been entered, while at numerous localities in front

of them fierce fighting was taking place around strong points still occupied by our troops.

Assisted by the long spell of dry weather, hostile infantry had crossed the river and canal north of La Fère, and south of St. Quentin had penetrated into the battle zone between Essigny and Benay. At Maissemy also our battle positions were entered at about noon, but the vigorous resistance of the 61st and 24th Divisions, assisted by troops of the 1st Cavalry Division, prevented the enemy from developing his success.

On the Third Army front also the attack had succeeded by midday in breaking into the battle zone at certain points, and heavy fighting was taking place all along the line from the Canal du Nord north-westwards to the Sensée river. Astride the canal the enemy was held up by the 17th Division, under command of Major-General P. R. Robertson, C.B., C.M.G., and made no progress. Farther west he had entered Doignies and had taken Louveral. In Lagnicourt and to the south of it the 6th Division, under command of Major-General T. O. Marden, C.M.G., were still maintaining a gallant fight for the possession of the first line of their battle positions; but beyond that village the battle zone had been entered at Noreuil, Longatte, and Ecoust St. Mein, all of which places had fallen into the enemy's hands.

(16) Fighting in and in front of our battle positions continued with the greatest intensity throughout the afternoon and evening. Except for certain small gains, the enemy was held by our defence, and even driven back in places by our counter-attacks. Reports received from all parts of the front testified to the unusual severity of his losses.

The most serious progress made by the enemy during this part of the struggle was on the right, south of St. Quentin. At Fargnier, having reached the eastern portion of the village by 4 P.M., during the remainder of the day his troops pressed on to the Crozat Canal and captured Quessy. North of this point the 18th Division, under command of Major-General R. P. Lee, C.B., reinforced by troops of the 2nd Cavalry Division, still held their battle positions intact, though threatened on both flanks by the enemy's progress at Quessy and at Benay, and successfully restored the situation in the neighbourhood of Ly-Fontaine by a counter-attack. Many of the strong points in the forward zone on the front of this division were also holding out, though surrounded. Wireless messages from their gallant defenders were received as late as 8.30 P.M., and rifle fire was heard in their vicinity until midnight.

Between the neighbourhood of Benay and the Somme Canal, the enemy by the evening had forced back our troops, after heavy fighting, to the rear line of their battle positions. Parties of our infantry, however, were still holding out east and north-east of Essigny, and certain of our troops in front of this line were still intact.

About Roupy and Savy all hostile attempts, in which tanks were used, to break into the battle positions of the 30th Division, under command of Major-General W. de L. Williams, C.M.G., D.S.O., were repulsed with the heaviest losses, our troops carrying out a number of successful counter-attacks. In this sector, the advancing German infantry frequently bunched together and offered good targets to our artillery and machine-guns.

On the remainder of the Fifth Army front our battle positions still

held, the 9th Division, under command of Major-General H. H. Tudor, C.B., C.M.G., retaining also nearly the whole of their forward positions, having twice retaken by counter-attack the important local feature on their right flank known as Chapel Hill.

On the Third Army front, our line in the Flesquières salient had not been heavily attacked, and was substantially intact. Beyond this sector, fierce fighting took place around Demicourt and Doignies, and north of the village of Beaumetz-les-Cambrai. In this area the 51st Division, under command of Major-General G. T. C. Carter-Campbell, D.S.O., was heavily engaged, but from noon onwards practically no progress was made by the enemy. A counter-attack carried out by two battalions of the 19th Division, Major-General G. D. Jeffreys, C.M.G., commanding the division, with a company of tanks, recovered a portion of this ground in the face of strong resistance, and secured a few prisoners, though it proved unable to clear the village of Doignies.

Lagnicourt fell into the enemy's hands during the afternoon, and heavy attacks were made also between Noreuil and Croisilles. At one time, hostile infantry were reported to have broken through the rear line of our battle positions in this sector in the direction of Mory. By nightfall the situation had been restored; but meanwhile the enemy had reached the outskirts of St. Leger and was attacking the 34th Division, under command of Major-General C. L. Nicholson, C.B., C.M.G., about Croisilles heavily from the south-west. A strong attack launched at 5 P.M. against the 3rd Division, under command of Major-General C. J. Deverell, C.B., north of Fontaine-les-Croisilles on the left bank of the Sensée River, was broken up by machine-gun fire.

At the end of the first day, therefore, the enemy had made very considerable progress, but he was still firmly held in the battle zone, in which it had been anticipated that the real struggle would take place. Nowhere had he effected that immediate break-through for which his troops had been training for many weeks, and such progress as he had made had been bought at a cost which had already greatly reduced his chances of carrying out his ultimate purpose.

(17) In view of the progress made by the enemy south of St. Quentin, the thinness of our line on that front, and the lack of reserves with which to restore the situation in our battle positions, the Fifth Army Commander decided on the evening of March 21, after consultation with the G.O.C., III. Corps, to withdraw the divisions of that corps behind the Crozat Canal. The movement involved the withdrawal of the 36th Division, on the right of the XVIII. Corps, to the line of the Somme Canal.

The enemy's advance south and north of the Flesquières salient rendered a withdrawal by the V. Corps and by the 9th Division on its right necessary also. Orders were accordingly issued to the Divisions concerned for a line to be taken up, as a first stage, along the high ground known as Highland Ridge, and thence westwards along the Hindenburg Line to Havrincourt and Hermies.

These different withdrawals were carried out successfully during the night. The bridges across the Crozat and the Somme Canals were destroyed, though in some cases not with entire success, it being probable that certain of them were still practicable for infantry. Instances of great

bravery occurred in the destruction of these bridges. In one case, when the electrical connexion for firing the demolition charge had failed, the officer responsible for the destruction of the bridge personally lit the instantaneous fuse and blew up the bridge. Many of the bridges were destroyed in the close presence of the enemy.

As by this time it had become clear that practically the whole of the enemy's striking force had been committed to this one battle, my plans already referred to for collecting reserves from other parts of the British front were put into immediate execution. By drawing away local reserves and thinning out the front not attacked, it was possible, as pointed out above, to reinforce the battle by eight divisions before the end of the month. Steps were taken also to set in operation at once the schemes previously agreed upon with the French for taking over a portion of the battle front.

(18) On the morning of March 22 the ground was again enveloped in thick mist, under cover of which the enemy renewed his attacks in great strength all along the line. Fighting was again very heavy, and short-range fire from guns, rifles, and machine-guns caused enormous losses to the enemy's troops. The weight of this attack, however, combined with the impossibility of observing beforehand and engaging with artillery the massing of his troops, enabled him to press forward.

(19) In the south the enemy advanced during the morning as far as the line of the canal at Jussy, and a fierce struggle commenced for the passage of the canal, his troops bringing up trench mortars and machine-guns, and endeavouring to cross on rafts under cover of their fire. At 1 P.M. he succeeded in effecting a crossing at Quessy, and made progress during the afternoon in the direction of Vouel. His further advance in this sector, however, was delayed by the gallant resistance of troops of the 58th Division, under command of Major-General A. B. E. Cator, D.S.O., at Tergnier, and it was not until evening, after many costly attempts and much sanguinary fighting, that the enemy gained possession of this village. During the afternoon hostile infantry crossed the canal also at La Montagne and at Jussy, but in both cases were counter-attacked and driven back by troops of the 18th Division and 2nd Cavalry Division, Major-General T. T. Pitman, C.B., commanding the 2nd Cavalry Division.

(20) In the centre of the battle front the enemy made a strong and determined effort to develop the success gained at Templeux-le-Guérard on the previous day, and in the early morning captured Ste. Emilie and Hervilly. Hervilly was retaken by troops of the 1st Cavalry Division (under command of Major-General R. L. Mullens, C.B.), assisted by tanks, at 9 A.M. At midday, after heavy fighting in the neighbourhood of Roisel, the 66th Division, under command of Major-General N. Malcolm, D.S.O., still held their positions in this sector, having for the time being definitely stopped the enemy's advance.

To the south and north, however, the progress of the German infantry continued. Constantly attacked from almost every direction, Le Verguier fell into the enemy's hands at about 10 A.M., after a most gallant defence. On the left bank of the Cologne River the capture of Ste. Emilie was followed by the fall of Villers Faucon, and both Roisel and Epehy were threatened with envelopment from the rear.

Accordingly, our troops about Roisel were withdrawn during the afternoon under orders, the enemy making no attempt to interfere, and were directed to reorganise behind the line of our third defensive belt between Bernes and Boucly, which was already manned by the 50th Division, temporarily commanded by Brig.-General A. F. U. Stockley, C.M.G. Later in the afternoon the troops of the 21st Division in Epehy also fell back under orders, though with more difficulty, as parties of hostile infantry were west of the village. To the north the 9th Division held their battle positions practically intact until the late afternoon, when they were withdrawn under orders to the rear line of defence between Nurlu and Equancourt. This retirement also was made with great difficulty.

(21) The divisions holding the Flesquières salient were not seriously involved during the morning of March 22, but in the evening strong attacks were made both at Villers Plouich and at Havrincourt. All these attacks were repulsed with great slaughter.

Farther north fighting was severe and continuous throughout the day. Shortly before noon the enemy attacked Hermies strongly from the north-west, and repeated his attacks at intervals during the remainder of the day. These attacks were completely repulsed by the 17th Division. Heavy losses were inflicted on the German infantry in the fighting in this area, the leading waves of a strong attack launched between Hermies and Beaumetz-les-Cambrai being destroyed by our fire.

In the neighbourhood of Beaumetz the enemy continued his assaults with great determination, but was held by the 51st Division and a brigade of the 25th Division until the evening, Major-General Sir E. G. T. Bainbridge, K.C.B., commanding the 25th Division. Our troops were then withdrawn under orders to positions south of the village. Very severe fighting took place at Vaulx Wood and Vaulx Vraucourt, as well as about St. Leger and north of Croisilles, which latter village our troops had evacuated during the night.

At Vraucourt the enemy broke through the rear line of the battle zone and penetrated into the village. There he was counter-attacked by infantry and tanks, and driven out. Farther west, after heavy fighting, his troops forced their way into our positions along the line of the Croisilles-Henin-sur-Cojeul road. On the left of this attack troops of the 34th Division maintained themselves in St. Leger until the afternoon, when they fell back to a line of trenches just west of the village. To the north the 3rd Division brought back their right flank to a line facing south-east, and in this position successfully beat off a heavy attack.

(22) With Maissemy already in the enemy's hands, the fall of Le Verquier greatly weakened the defence of the centre of the Fifth Army. The rear line of our battle positions was held during the morning, in spite of unceasing pressure from large hostile forces, but as the day wore on the great concentration of German divisions attacking west of St. Quentin had its effect. During the early afternoon our troops east of Holnon Wood were forced to withdraw from their battle zone trenches; while after repulsing heavy attacks throughout the morning, the 50th Division were again attacked during the afternoon and evening and compelled to give ground. Our troops, fighting fiercely and continuously, were gradually forced out of the battle zone on the whole of this front, and fell back

through the 20th Division, under command of Major-General W. D. Smith, C.B., and the 50th Division holding the third defensive zone between Hapencourt, Villévêque, and Boucly, in the hope of reorganising behind them.

In this fighting the action of the 1st Battalion Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers, 36th Division, deserves special mention. This battalion held a redoubt in the forward zone near Fontaine-les-Clercs throughout the whole of the first day of the battle, and on the following day, after the troops on their right had withdrawn in accordance with orders, still maintained their position, although surrounded by the enemy. After a magnificent fight, in which all the enemy's attacks were repulsed with great loss, at 3 P.M. the officer commanding the battalion sent back a small party of troops, who succeeded in getting through to our lines. The remainder of the battalion continued the fight to the end.

By 5.30 P.M. the enemy had reached the third zone at different points, and was attacking the 50th Division heavily between Villévêque and Boucly. Though holding an extended front at some 10,500 yards, the division succeeded in checking the enemy's advance, and by a successful counter-attack drove him temporarily from the village of Coulaincourt. At the close of the engagement, however, the troops of the 50th Division about Poeuilly had been forced back, and by continued pressure along the south bank of the Omignon River the enemy had opened a gap between their right flank and the troops of the 61st Division, under command of Major-General C. J. Mackenzie, C.B., and of the 20th Division farther south. At this gap, during the late afternoon and evening, strong bodies of German troops broke through the third defensive zone about Vaux and Beauvois.

All available reserves at the disposal of the Fifth Army had already been thrown into the fight, and except for one French division and some French cavalry in the III. Corps area no further support was within reach of the fighting line. There remained, therefore, no course open but to fall back on the bridgehead positions east of the Somme. -

(23) Accordingly, at 11 P.M. on March 22, orders were issued by the Fifth Army Commander that the troops of the XVII. Corps should fall back during the night behind the line of the Somme south of Voyennes, in touch with the III. Corps on their right; while the XIX. and VII. Corps endeavoured to secure the main Péronne bridgehead on the line Croix Molignaux-Monchy Lagache-Vraignes, and thence northwards along the third zone of defence to the junction with the Third Army about Equancourt.

These withdrawals were carried out under constant pressure from the enemy, covered by rearguards of the 20th, 50th and 39th Divisions (Major-General E. Feetham, C.B., C.M.G., commanding the last-mentioned Division), which were continually in action with the German troops.

On the Third Army front also, certain necessary readjustments of our line were carried out during the night. On the right, the evacuation of the Flesquières salient was continued, our troops withdrawing to a line covering Equancourt and Metz-en-Couture in touch with the Fifth Army about Equancourt. In the centre, the troops still in advance of the third defensive zone were brought back to that system. On the left, our troops withdrew from the remainder of their forward positions south of the

Scarpe, taking up the rear line of their battle positions between Henin-sur-Cojeul and Fampoux.

As on the southern portion of the battle front, the enemy followed up our troops closely, except on the left, where for a time he was unaware of what we had done. Elsewhere, more or less continuous fighting took place throughout the night, and in the early morning parties of the enemy succeeded in finding a gap in our new line about Mory.

(24) Reports that the enemy had forced the line of the Crozat Canal, combined with the loss of the Vaux-Poeuilly positions, and information obtained by the Air Service that the German front as far back as Mont D'Origny was packed with advancing troops, led the Fifth Army Commander to reconsider his decision to offer battle afresh east of the Somme. Considering that if involved in a general engagement his tired troops might be exposed to a decisive defeat before help could arrive, and that the situation might then be exploited by the enemy to a disastrous extent, he decided to continue the withdrawal at once to the west bank of the Somme.

On the morning of March 23, therefore, confirming instructions previously given by telephone, orders were issued by the Fifth Army to the XIX. Corps to carry out a gradual withdrawal to the line of the Somme. The VII. Corps was directed to conform to this movement and to take up a position on the general line Doingt-Nurlu.

This order involved the abandonment of the main Péronne bridgehead position. It greatly shortened the time available for clearing our troops and removable material from the east bank of the river, for completing the necessary final preparations for the destruction of the river and canal bridges, for reforming west of the river the divisions which had suffered most in the previous fighting, and generally for securing the adequate defence of the river line.

(25) Meanwhile, the enemy had recommenced his attacks. The footing obtained by him on the west bank of the Crozat Canal was gradually increased, in spite of counter-attacks by British and French troops at Tergnier and at other points. During the morning he forced the passage of the canal at Jussy, where he was reported to have employed tanks east of the canal. Shortly afterwards hostile infantry crossed at Mennessis, though suffering great loss from the fire of a machine-gun detachment of the Canadian Cavalry Brigade. By midday our troops had been pressed back from the line of the canal to the wooded ground to the west, where fierce confused fighting continued throughout the afternoon about Noureuxil, Failoulle, and Cugny, infantry and cavalry offering a most resolute resistance to the enemy's advance and performing many gallant actions.

(26) In the course of the withdrawal to the Somme on the previous night, a gap occurred in our line in the neighbourhood of Ham, and the enemy, following closely upon our troops, entered the town during the early morning. Before midday bodies of German infantry, though at first only in small numbers, succeeded in crossing the river about Ham and Pithon, where the bridges had not been completely destroyed. In the afternoon these forces increased in strength, gradually pressing back our troops, until a spirited counter-attack by troops of the 20th and 61st

Divisions about Verlaines restored the situation in this locality. To the east of this point, heavy fighting took place around Ollezy which the 36th Division, under command of Major-General O. S. W. Nugent, C.B., D.S.O., regained and held until a late hour, and around Aubigny and Brouchy, both of which villages, however, fell into the enemy's hands before night.

Farther north, the withdrawal to the west bank of the Somme was carried out successfully during the morning and early afternoon, effectively covered by troops of the 50th Division. By 3.15 P.M. all troops were across the river, and the bridges for the most part destroyed.

All bridges over the canals and rivers in the Fifth Army area had been carefully listed early in February and reconnoitred for demolition. The necessary explosives were stored in the neighbourhood of each bridge, and a definite party of Royal Engineers detailed for its destruction. As has been seen, however, owing to the effects of the enemy's artillery fire, which blew up some of the charges and cut the leads of others, the destruction of the bridges was in certain cases incomplete.

None the less, the situation on the Somme front north of Ham was for the time being not unsatisfactory. In the course of the afternoon strong attacks at Offoy and Bethemcourt were repulsed with heavy loss by rifle and machine-gun fire. In the evening the enemy's attempts to come down the open slopes on the east bank of the river were heavily punished by artillery fire, as they were on several subsequent occasions. It is believed that north of Ham none of the enemy succeeded in crossing the river before nightfall.

(27) Meanwhile, very heavy fighting had been taking place on the northern portion of the battle front. The enemy pressed closely upon our troops, as they withdrew to the line of the ridge running from north of Péronne to Nurlu and Equancourt. Heavy attacks developed at an early hour between these two places, and also between Le Bucquière and Beugny and at Mory.

On the Third Army front, where our resources were greater, the enemy was held in check, though he gained possession of Le Bucquière and Beugny after a prolonged struggle. In this fighting the 9th Battalion Welsh Regiment, 19th Division, greatly distinguished itself in the defence of Beugny, which it held till dusk, thereby enabling the other battalions of its brigade in position to the north of the village to extricate themselves successfully from what would otherwise have been a hopeless situation.

No less than six separate attacks, in two of which the enemy brought up cavalry and guns, were repulsed by the 124th Brigade of the 41st Division, Major-General Sir T. S. B. Lawford, K.C.B., commanding the division, opposite Vaulx Vraucourt. The fighting in this sector of the front was very severe, but here and at all points north of the Bapaume-Cambrai Road our line was maintained. About 3.30 P.M. the enemy again attacked five times from the direction of Vaulx and five times from Beaumetz-lez-Cambrai, and on each occasion was repulsed. The 40th Division, under command of Major-General J. Ponsonby, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., regained Mory during the afternoon by successful counter-attacks, and the 31st Division, under command of Major-General R. J. Bridgford, C.B., C.M.G.,

D.S.O., drove off the attacks of two German divisions about St. Leger with heavy loss.

(28) At the junction of the Third and Fifth Armies the situation was less satisfactory, and as the day wore on it became critical.

During the morning the divisions of the V. Corps had proceeded with their withdrawal, and, covered by rearguards who were heavily engaged, had fallen back from the Metz-en-Couture salient to the defences of the third zone about Ytres. The left of the VII. Corps, however, had been withdrawn under orders during the morning from the Nurlu positions to the line of the Canal du Nord, north of Moislains. As the result of this movement, a gap was formed between the flank divisions of the two corps, and this gap the enemy rapidly exploited. Though vigorous efforts were made to re-establish touch both by the 47th Division, under command of Major-General Sir G. F. Gorringe, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., D.S.O., and by a brigade of the 2nd Division, Major-General C. E. Pereira, C.B., C.M.G., commanding the division, they were unsuccessful. The right of the V. Corps was forced back by pressure from the south-east first to the neighbourhood of Four Winds Farms, south of Ytres, where troops of the 47th Division made a gallant stand in the open until nightfall and later to a position East of Rocquigny.

The divisions of the VII. Corps, after heavy fighting during the afternoon, were forced back west of Péronne, and across the line of the River Tortille to the high ground about Bouchavesnes and Government Farm, south of Sailly-Saillisel. At dusk, however, the line was still in movement. Small parties of the enemy searched constantly for gaps, and, having found them, bodies of German infantry pressed through in force and compelled our troops to make further withdrawals.

(29) From the time when the indications of an offensive on my front first became definite I had been in close touch with the Commander-in-Chief of the French Armies. On different occasions, as the battle developed, I discussed with him the situation and the policy to be followed by the Allied Armies. As the result of a meeting held in the afternoon of March 23, arrangements were made for the French to take over as rapidly as possible the front held by the Fifth Army south of Péronne, and for the concentration of a strong force of French divisions on the southern portion of the battle front.

For my own part, after consultation with the First and Second Army Commanders, General Sir H. S. Horne, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., and General Sir H. C. O. Plumer, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O., concerning the situation on the fronts of their Armies and the possibilities of attacks developing there also, I arranged for the formation from the troops under their command of a special force of reserve divisions for action as occasion might demand. Measures were also taken to permit of the employment of the Canadian Corps for counter-attack, in the event of the enemy succeeding in piercing my front.

In this connexion I desire to express my deep appreciation of the complete unselfishness with which the needs of their own fronts were at all times subordinated by the Army Commanders to the more pressing demands of the battle. A variety of considerations made it necessary for me at this date to draw particularly heavily upon the resources of the

Second Army. All my demands were met by the Second Army Commander in the most helpful and disinterested spirit.

(30) During the night of March 23-24 the situation on the battle front remained unchanged as far south as the neighbourhood of Ytres. Beyond that point divisions and brigades had lost touch in the course of their frequent withdrawals, and under the constant pressure of the enemy the rearward movement continued. At dawn German infantry had already reached Bus, Lechelle, and Le Mesnil-en-Arrouaise, and during the morning of March 24 entered Saillisel, Rancourt, and Cléry. It became necessary to order the evacuation of Bertincourt, and gradually to swing back the right of the Third Army in conformity with the movement farther south. To the north of Bertincourt, though the enemy gained possession of Mory in the early morning after continuous fighting throughout the night, our troops substantially maintained their positions, the Guards Division, under command of Major-General G. P. T. Feilding, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., and the 3rd and 31st Divisions in particular, beating off a succession of heavy attacks.

The enemy's advance at the junction of the Third and Fifth Armies was not made without heavy sacrifice. In the retirement of our troops there was no panic of any sort. Units retreated stubbornly from one position to another as they found them turned and threatened with isolation; but at many points fierce engagements were fought, and wherever the enemy attempted a frontal attack he was beaten off with loss.

During the early part of the morning troops of the 17th Division drove off four attacks east of Barastre, and the 47th Division held the village of Rocquigny from sunrise until well into the afternoon, beating off all attacks with rifle and machine-gun fire, until the enemy worked round their flank between Rocquigny and Le Transloy and forced them to withdraw.

South of this point, however, the enemy pressed forward rapidly through the gap which he had made, and succeeded in isolating a part of the South African Brigade, 9th Division, near Marrières Wood, north of Cléry. These troops maintained a most gallant resistance until 4.30 p.m., when they had fired off all their ammunition, and only about 100 men remained unwounded. Early in the afternoon German infantry entered Combles, and having gained the high ground at Morval, were advancing towards Les Boeufs. Their continued progress threatened to sever the connexion between the Fifth and Third Armies and the situation was serious.

In view of this situation the V. and IV. Corps were ordered to fall back to the general line, Bazentin—Le Sars—Grevillers—Ervillers. Meanwhile the leading troops of the 35th Division, under command of Major-General G. McK. Franks, C.B., which was arriving at Bray-sur-Somme, and certain composite battalions composed of all available troops in the Albert area and including tanks personnel with Lewis guns, were hurried forward along the north bank of the river to the support of the VII. Corps. During the afternoon also, units of the 1st Cavalry Division reached Montauban.

The enemy had already passed Cléry, and was pressing the remaining troops of the 9th and 21st Divisions hard when these various bodies of

troops came into action. The 15th Battalion Cheshire Regiment and the 15th Battalion Notts and Derby Regiment, of the 35th Division, checked the enemy by a successful counter-attack, and thereafter a line was taken up and held from the river at Hem to Trônes Wood and Longueval. For the moment the danger in this sector was averted.

The withdrawal of the right and centre of the Third Army was carried out during the afternoon and evening in circumstances of great difficulty, as on the right flank bodies of German infantry were already between our troops and the positions to which they were directed to fall back. In this withdrawal valuable service was rendered by twelve machine-guns of the 63rd Division, Machine-Gun Battalion, in Les Boeufs. These guns held up the enemy's advance from Morval at a critical period, firing 25,000 rounds into the enemy's advancing masses, and by their action enabling their division to reach the position assigned to it.

By nightfall the divisions of the V. Corps had taken up their line successfully between Bazentin, High Wood, Eaucourt l'Abbaye and Ligny-Thillois. Before midnight the troops of the IV. Corps, who had carried out their withdrawal by stages in the face of constant attacks, were established on the line assigned to them west of Bapaume, between Le Barque and Ervillers. Touch between the several divisions of the V. Corps and between the V. and IV. Corps, however, was not properly established.

(31) South of Péronne the night of March 23-24 passed comparatively quietly; but with the dawn powerful attempts were made by the enemy to force the crossings of the Somme, and these attempts were by no means confined to the recognised points of passage. Owing to the dry weather the river and marshes did not constitute a very formidable obstacle to infantry, while the trees and undergrowth along the valley afforded good cover to the enemy, and limited the field of fire of the defenders.

In the early morning, hostile forces which had crossed the river at St. Christ and Bethencourt were attacked and driven back by troops of the 8th Division, under command of Major-General W. C. G. Heneker, C.B., D.S.O., and of the 20th Division; but at Pargny the enemy succeeded in maintaining himself on the west bank of the river, and the flanks of the 8th and 20th Divisions were no longer in touch. During the remainder of the day the enemy repeated his attacks at these and other points, and also exercised strong pressure in a westerly and south-westerly direction from Ham. Our troops offered vigorous resistance, and opposite Ham a successful counter-attack by the 1/5th (Pioneer) Battalion, Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry, 61st Division, materially delayed his advance.

At nightfall the line of the river north of Epenancourt was still held by us, but the gap opposite Pargny had been enlarged, and the enemy had reached Morchain. South of that point the 20th Division, with its left flank in the air and having exhausted all reserves in a series of gallant and successful counter-attacks, fell back during the afternoon to the line of the Libermont Canal, to which position the great weight of the enemy's attacks from Ham had already pressed back the troops on its right.

(32) In the area between the Somme and the Oise the enemy's attacks had recommenced at dawn in thick fog, and were pressed with great energy. Troops of the 20th and 36th Divisions at Eaucourt and Ougny found their retreat endangered by the progress made by the enemy on

their flanks, and extricated themselves with difficulty, falling back on Villeselve, and ultimately to the neighbourhood of Guiscard. The withdrawal of the troops at Cugny was made possible by a brilliant mounted charge by a squadron of the 6th Cavalry Brigade, which broke through the German line, taking over 100 prisoners, and sabring a large number of the enemy.

Throughout the whole of the fighting in this area very gallant work was done, both mounted and dismounted, by units of the 2nd and 3rd Cavalry Divisions, Major-General A. E. W. Harman, D.S.O., commanding the 3rd Cavalry Division, in support of our own and the French infantry. The work of the mounted troops, in particular, was invaluable, demonstrating in marked fashion the importance of the part which cavalry have still to play in modern war. So urgent was the demand for more mounted men that arrangements were made during the progress of the battle to provide with horses several regiments of Yeomanry who had but recently been dismounted for employment with other arms. In common with the rest of the cavalry, these Yeomanry did excellent service. Without the assistance of mounted troops, skilfully handled and gallantly led, the enemy could scarcely have been prevented from breaking through the long and thinly held front of broken and wooded ground before the French reinforcements had had time to arrive.

Though French troops were coming rapidly to the assistance of the III. Corps, which on this day passed under the command of the Third French Army, the Allied forces were not yet in sufficient strength to hold up the enemy's advance. After heavy fighting throughout the morning to the east and north of Chauny, our line was gradually forced back to the south and west of that town. In the course of the night the French and British troops immediately north of the Oise were withdrawn to the ridge above Crepigny, whence the line ran across the high ground covering Noyon to the neighbourhood of Guiscard and Libermont.

(33) During the night of March 24-25 constant fighting took place on the northern portion of the battle front about Sapignies and Behagnies, where the enemy made determined but unsuccessful efforts to break through.

On the following day the enemy maintained great pressure on this front from Ervillers to the south. Shortly after dawn a very heavy attack on our positions east of the Arras-Bapaume road between Favreuil and Ervillers was repulsed with great loss, and a counter-attack by the 42nd Division, under command of Major-General A. Solly-Flood, C.M.G., D.S.O., drove the enemy out of Sapignies. Later in the morning the 2nd Division beat off an attack at Ligny-Thilloy, and our positions to the north of this point were maintained practically unchanged until midday.

At noon fresh attacks developed in great force, and under the weight of the assault the right of the IV. Corps, with which the divisions of the V. Corps were not in touch, was gradually pressed back. The enemy gained Grevillers, in which neighbourhood the 19th Division was hotly engaged, and also Bihucourt. North of this point our positions were substantially maintained, and at the end of the day our troops still held Ervillers, where the 1st/10th Battalion Manchester Regiment, 42nd Division, had repulsed eight attacks.

On the north bank of the Somme also, between the neighbourhood of Hem and Trônes Wood, all the enemy's attacks were held. Though their left flank was constantly in the air, the various forces operating in this sector maintained a gallant and most successful resistance all day, counter-attacking frequently. Prisoners from five German divisions were taken by us in the course of this fighting, and the enemy's casualties were stated by them to be abnormally heavy.

Between Montauban and the neighbourhood of Grevillers, however, our troops had been unable to establish touch on the line to which they had withdrawn on March 24. After heavy fighting throughout the morning and the early part of the afternoon in which the 63rd Division in particular, under command of Major-General C. E. Lawrie, C.B., D.S.O., beat off a number of strong assaults, divisions commenced to fall back individually towards the Ancre widening the gap between the V. and IV. Corps.

During the afternoon the enemy reached Courcellette, and was pressing on through the gap in our line in the direction of Pys and Irlès, seriously threatening the flank of the IV. Corps. It became clear that the Third Army, which on this day had assumed command of all troops north of the Somme, would have to continue the withdrawal of its centre to the line of the River Ancre, already crossed by certain of our troops near Beaucourt. All possible steps were taken to secure this line, but by nightfall hostile patrols had reached the right bank of the Ancre north of Miraumont and were pushing forward between the flanks of the V. and IV. Corps in the direction of Serre and Puisieux-au-Mont. In view of this situation, the IV. Corps fell back by stages during the night and morning to the line Bucquoy-Ablainzeville, in touch with the VI. Corps about Boyelles. On the right the remaining divisions of the Third Army were withdrawn under orders to the line Bray-sur-Somme-Albert, and thence took up positions along the west bank of the Ancre to the neighbourhood of Beaumont Hamel.

In spite of the dangerous gap about Serre, the general position on the Third Army front, though still serious, gave less cause for anxiety. Considerable reinforcements had now come into line, and had shown their ability to hold the enemy, whose troops were becoming tired, while the transport difficulties experienced by him in the area of the old Somme battlefield were increasing. Other reinforcements were coming up rapidly, and there seemed every hope that the line of the Ancre would be secured and the enemy stopped north of the Somme.

(34) South of the Somme the situation was less satisfactory. The greater portion of the defensive line along the river and canal had been lost, and that which was still held by us was endangered by the progress made by the enemy north of the Somme. All local reserves had already been put into the fight, and there was no immediate possibility of sending further British troops to the assistance of the divisions in line.

On the other hand, the French forces engaged were increasing steadily, and on this day our Allies assumed responsibility for the battle front south of the Somme, with general control of the British troops operating in that sector. The situation still remained critical, however, for every mile of the German advance added to the length of front to be held, and, while the exhaustion of my divisions was hourly growing more acute, some days had

yet to pass before the French could bring up troops in sufficient strength to arrest the enemy's progress.

(35) During the night the enemy had gained possession of Guiscard, and in the early morning of March 25 strongly attacked the Allied positions on the wooded spurs and ridges east and north-east of Noyon. The position of the French and English batteries north of the Oise Canal became hazardous, and they were accordingly withdrawn across the canal at Appily. Dismounted troops of the Canadian Cavalry Brigade actively assisted in covering this withdrawal, which was successfully completed at 1 P.M. Shortly afterwards another heavy attack developed in this sector and was checked after hard fighting. At the close of this engagement troops of the 18th Division retook the village of Babœuf by a brilliant counter-attack, capturing 150 prisoners. Early in the fight French armoured cars rendered valuable service and killed a number of the enemy.

Meanwhile the enemy's progress south and west of Guiscard had continued, and that night his troops entered Noyon. The French and British troops to the east of the town were therefore ordered to withdraw southwards across the Oise, and by the morning of March 26 this had been successfully accomplished.

After this date the troops of the III. Corps were gradually relieved by the French reinforcements and sent north to rejoin the Fifth Army.

(36) On the Fifth Army front, also, fighting had recommenced at an early hour. Hostile attacks at Licourt and to the south of it widened the gap between the XVIII. and XIX. Corps and the enemy entered Nesle, forcing the French and British troops back to the high ground on the south bank of the Ingon River, south-west of the town. To the south of this point his troops crossed the Libermont Canal, while to the north the right of the XIX. Corps was slowly pushed back in the direction of Chaulnes. Marcheipot was burning, but our troops at midday were reported to be still holding the line of the canal east of Villers, Carbonnel, and Barleux.

In view, however, of the situation to the south and the progress made by the enemy on the right bank of the Somme west of Péronne, it was impossible for this position to be maintained. Accordingly, our troops were gradually withdrawn during the evening to the general line Hatten-court-Estées-Frise, the 39th Division delivering a counter-attack south of Biaches to cover the withdrawal in that area.

A gap still existed between the XVIII. and XIX. Corps west of Nesle, and the Germans had already reached Liancourt Wood, when the 61st Brigade of the 20th Division, which had hitherto been engaged with the 36th Division farther south, was brought up in buses to the neighbourhood of Liancourt. Though reduced to some 450 rifles in its previous fighting, the brigade successfully held up the enemy's advance and made it possible for the remainder of its division to withdraw unmolested through Roye on the morning of March 26.

(37) The whole of the troops holding the British line south of the Somme were now greatly exhausted, and the absence of reserves behind them gave ground for considerable anxiety. As the result of a conference held by the Fifth Army Commander on March 25, a mixed force, including details, stragglers, schools personnel, tunnelling companies, Army troops companies, field survey companies, and Canadian and American engineers,

had been got together and organised by General Grant, the Chief Engineer to the Fifth Army. On March 26 these were posted by General Grant, in accordance with orders given by the Fifth Army Commander, on the line of the old Amiens defences between Mezières, Marcelcave, and Hamel. Subsequently, as General Grant could ill be spared from his proper duties, he was directed to hand over command of his force to General Carey.

Except for General Carey's force there were no reinforcements of any kind behind the divisions which had been fighting for the most part continuously since the opening of the battle. In consideration of this fact and the thinness of our fighting line, the Fifth Army Commander did not deem it practicable for our troops to attempt to maintain the Hattencourt-Frise positions if seriously attacked. Accordingly, orders had been given on the night of March 25 that, in the event of the enemy continuing his assaults in strength, divisions should fall back, fighting rearguard actions, to the approximate line Le Quesnoy-Rosières-Proyart. This line was intended to link up with the right of the Third Army at Bray.

(38) On the morning of March 26 the enemy recommenced his attack in strength south-westwards and westwards from Nesle, in the double hope of separating the French and British Armies and interfering with the detrainng arrangements of our Allies by the capture of Montdidier.

Heavy attacks developed also about Hattencourt, in the neighbourhood of the St. Quentin-Amiens road, and at Herbecourt. Under the pressure of these assaults our divisions commenced to withdraw slowly, in accordance with orders to the line indicated above. This was taken up successfully and maintained, a number of hostile attacks during the afternoon and evening being beaten off by counter-attacks in which local commanders displayed great energy and initiative.

As the British forces retired westwards, however, the French troops on their right were gradually forced back in a south-westerly direction beyond Roye, leaving a gap between the French and British Armies of which the enemy took immediate advantage. To fill this gap the 36th and 30th Divisions, which on the previous day had been withdrawn to rest, were put once more into the battle and speedily became involved in heavy fighting about Andechy and to the north of that place. Though the enemy had penetrated behind them and had taken Erches, the troops of the 36th Division at Andechy maintained a most gallant resistance until the afternoon of March 27, thereby playing no small part in preventing the enemy from breaking through between the Allied Armies.

On this part of the battle front a very gallant feat of arms was performed on this day by a detachment of about 100 officers and men of the 61st Brigade, 20th Division, at Le Quesnoy. The detachment was detailed to cover the withdrawal of their division, and under the command of their Brigade Major, Captain E. P. Combe, M.C., successfully held the enemy at bay from early morning until 6 P.M. at night, when the eleven survivors withdrew under orders, having accomplished their task.

At the end of the day, although the enemy's thrust west of Roye had pressed back our right somewhat beyond the positions to which it had been intended to withdraw, the British forces south of the Somme were in touch with the French, and the general line, Guerbigny-Rouvroy-en-Santerre-Proyart, had been taken up successfully.

(39) Meanwhile north of the Somme the battle was entering upon its final stages, though the enemy's effort was not yet fully spent and his troops were still capable of powerful attacks.

During the morning of March 26 our troops continued the taking up of the Ancre line without much interference from the enemy, but between Hamel and Puisieux the situation was not yet clear. A gap still existed in this area between the V. and IV. Corps, through which bodies of German infantry worked their way forward and occupied Colincamps with machine-guns. These machine-guns were silenced by a section of field artillery of the 2nd Division, which gallantly galloped into action and engaged them over open sights. Early in the afternoon troops of the New Zealand Division, under command of Major-General Sir A. H. Russell, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., retook Colincamps, while a brigade of the 4th Australian Division, Major-General E. G. Sinclair-Maclagan, C.B., D.S.O., commanding the division, filled the gap between Hebuterne and Bucquoy. In the fighting in this area our light tanks came into action for the first time and did valuable service.

With the arrival of fresh troops our line on this part of the front became stable, and all attempts made by the enemy during the day to drive in our positions about Bucquoy and to the north were repulsed with great loss.

(40) Farther south the Bray-sur-Somme-Albert line had been taken up successfully on the night of March 25-26, and fighting of a minor character occurred during the morning, particularly at Meaulte, where troops of the 9th Division beat off a strong attack. Owing, however, to a misunderstanding the Bray-sur-Somme-Albert line was regarded by the local commander as being merely a stage in a further retirement to the line of the Ancre, south of Albert. Accordingly on the afternoon and evening of March 26 the withdrawal was continued, and when the higher command became aware of the situation the movement had already proceeded too far for our former positions to be re-established.

By the time the withdrawal had been stopped the right of the Third Army rested on the Somme about Sailly-le-Sac; while the Fifth Army still held the south bank of the Somme north of Proyart, about five miles farther east. The left flank of the Fifth Army, therefore, was dangerously uncovered, being protected merely by the natural obstacle of the river and an improvised force of 350 men with Lewis guns and armoured cars which had been sent up to hold the crossings.

(41) On this day, March 26, the Governments of France and Great Britain decided to place the supreme control of the operations of the French and British forces in France and Belgium in the hands of General Foch, who accordingly assumed control.

(42) During the night of March 26-27, the enemy had gained possession of Albert after some fighting with our rearguards in the town, and obtained a footing in Aveluy Wood. His efforts to force our positions on the high ground west of the Ancre, however, met with no success, and several attempts made by him on March 27 to debouch from Albert were driven back with heavy loss to his troops.

About midday a series of strong attacks commenced all along our front from about Bucquoy to the neighbourhood of Hamelincourt, in the

course of which the enemy gained possession of Ablainzeville and Alette. Elsewhere all his assaults were heavily repulsed by troops of the 62nd Division, under command of Major-General W. P. Braithwaite, C.B., and of the 42nd and Guards Divisions. On the remainder of our front north of the Somme, save for minor readjustments of our line at certain points, in the course of which we captured a number of prisoners and machine-guns, our positions remained unchanged.

(43) South of the Somme, meanwhile, the enemy had recommenced his attacks at about 8.30 A.M. on the greater part of the Fifth Army front and against the French. The line occupied by our troops at this time, had it been maintained, would have preserved Amiens from serious bombardment, and orders were issued that every effort was to be made to hold our positions. In the fighting which followed troops of all divisions, despite the weakness of the numbers and the tremendous strain through which they had already gone, displayed a courage and determination in their defence for which no praise can be too high.

At 10 A.M. the 8th Division at Rosières had already repulsed a heavy attack, and the enemy was pressing hard against our positions in the neighbourhood of Proyart. The results of the unfortunate withdrawal from Bray now became apparent. The enemy was not slow to take advantage of the position held by him along the north bank of the Somme in the rear of our troops, and in spite of our efforts to destroy or hold the river crossings, began to pass strong parties of infantry to the south bank at Cerisy.

Being heavily attacked in front and with bodies of the enemy established south of the river in their immediate rear, our troops at Proyart and to the north were compelled to fall back. The enemy gained Framerville, Proyart, and Morcourt, and endeavoured to advance southwards behind our line.

In view of the absence of reserves behind this front other than the composite force already referred to, the situation was serious. Troops of the 1st Cavalry Division were hurried across the river and occupied Bouzencourt, in which neighbourhood they had sharp fighting. A very gallant and successful counter-attack, carried out with great dash by the 2nd Battalion Devon Regiment and the 22nd (Pioneer) Battalion Durham Light Infantry, both of the 8th Division (which was itself heavily engaged at the time at Rosières), supported by troops of the 50th Division, at this date under command of Major-General H. C. Jackson, D.S.O., held up the enemy a short distance south-west of Proyart. A counter-attack by the 66th Division restored the situation about Framerville, and at nightfall our troops were still east and north of Harbonnières, whence our line ran north-westwards to Bouzencourt.

South of Harbonnières, the 8th Division held the village of Rosières against all attacks and killed great numbers of the enemy. South of this point, as far as Arvillers, troops of the 24th, 30th, and 20th Divisions maintained their positions substantially unchanged throughout the day, though beyond their right flank the enemy passed Davencourt and captured Montdidier.

(44) During the night of March 27-28, parties of the enemy worked their way southwards from Morcourt and Cerisy and entered Bayonvillers

and Warfusee-Abancourt, astride the main Amiens road. Our troops east of these places were seriously endangered, and in the early morning of March 28 were directed to withdraw to the line Vrely-Marcelcave. Our line from Marcelcave to the Somme was manned by Carey's Force, with the 1st Cavalry Division in close support. During the evening the enemy concentrated heavy artillery fire on Marcelcave and forced these troops to withdraw a short distance to the west of the village.

The position of our troops at Arvillers and Vrely, however, in the deep and narrow salient between the Avre and Luce Rivers, was rapidly becoming untenable. The enemy was pushing southwards from Guillaucourt, and beyond our right flank had entered Contoire and was pressing the French troops back upon Hangest-en-Santerre. A gallant attempt by troops of the 61st Division to regain Warfusee-Abancourt and lighten the pressure from the north proved unsuccessful, and in the course of the afternoon and evening our troops fell back through the 20th Division which during the evening was disposed on the line Mezières-Demuin. At night-fall we held approximately the Amiens defence line on the whole front south of the Somme from Mezières to Ignaucourt and Hamel.

The nature of the fighting on the southern portion of the battle front where our troops had been engaged for a full week with an almost overwhelming superiority of hostile forces had thrown an exceptional strain upon the Fifth Army Commander and his Staff. In order to avoid the loss of efficiency which a continuance of such a strain might have entailed, I decided to avail myself of the services of the Staff of the Fourth Army, which was at this time in reserve. General Sir H. S. Rawlinson, Bt., G.C.V.O., K.C.B., K.C.M.G., who had but recently given up the command on appointment to Versailles, accordingly returned to his old Army, and at 4.30 P.M. on this day assumed command of the British forces south of the Somme. At the same time the construction of new defence lines made necessary by the enemy's advance called for the appointment of an able and experienced Commander and Staff to direct this work and extemporise garrisons for their defence. I accordingly ordered General Gough to undertake this important task.

(45) Meanwhile between 7 and 8 A.M. on the morning of March 28 fighting of the utmost intensity had broken out north of the Somme from Puisieux to north-east of Arras. Finding himself checked on the northern flank of his attack, the enemy on this day made a determined effort to obtain greater freedom for the development of his offensive, and struck in great force along the valley of the Scarpe at Arras.

The development of the battle, which had been foreseen as early as March 23, involved the right of the XIII. Corps, under command of Lieut.-General Sir H. de B. de Lisle, K.C.B., D.S.O., on the right of the First Army, and represented a considerable extension of the original front of attack. A German success in this sector might well have had far-reaching effects. There is little doubt that the enemy hoped to achieve great results by this new stroke, and that its failure was a serious set-back to his plans.

After a bombardment of great violence three fresh German divisions advanced to the assault along the north bank of the Scarpe River against the positions held by the 4th and 56th British Divisions, under the command respectively of Major-General T. G. Matheson, C.B., and Major-

General F. A. Dudgeon, C.B., and were supported in their attack by the two German divisions already in line. According to captured documents the enemy's immediate object was to gain the general line Vimy-Bailleul-St. Laurent-Blangy, when three special assault divisions were to carry the Vimy Ridge on the following day. Immediately south of the Scarpe four German divisions were engaged, to two of which were assigned the tasks of capturing Arras and the heights overlooking the town. This assault, the weight of which fell on the 3rd and 15th British Divisions, Major-General H. L. Reed, V.C., C.B., C.M.G., commanding the latter division, was supported by powerful attacks, in which eleven hostile divisions were engaged, along our whole front southwards to beyond Bucquoy. Still farther south, as far as Dernancourt, strong local attacks were delivered at different points. The methods followed by the enemy on this occasion were the same as those employed by him on March 21, but in this instance the thick fog which had played so decisive a part on that day was absent. In consequence, our artillery and machine-guns were given every opportunity to engage the German infantry both when assembling and while advancing to the attack, and the heaviest losses were inflicted on them by our fire.

Immediately prior to the assault, masses of German infantry with artillery in rear of them were observed drawn up in close formation on Greenland Hill, and were shelled by our artillery. North of the Scarpe, about Rœux, great execution was done at point-blank range by single guns, which we had placed in forward positions close up to our front line. The enemy's infantry in this sector are reported to have advanced almost shoulder to shoulder in six lines, and on the whole front our machine-guns obtained most favourable targets.

The weight and momentum of his assault and the courage of his infantry, who sought to cut their way through our wire by hand under the fire of our machine-guns, sufficed to carry the enemy through the gaps which his bombardment had made in our outpost line. Thereafter, raked by the fire of our outposts, whose garrisons turned their machine-guns and shot at the enemy's advancing lines from flank and rear, and met by an accurate and intense fire from all arms, his troops were everywhere stopped and thrown back with the heaviest loss before our battle positions.

A second attack launched late in the afternoon north of the Scarpe, after a further period of bombardment, was also repulsed at all points. At the end of the day our battle positions astride the Scarpe were intact on the whole front of the attack, and in the evening successful counter-attacks enabled us to push out a new outpost line in front of them. Meanwhile the surviving garrisons of our original outpost line, whose most gallant resistance had played so large a part in breaking up the enemy's attack, had fought their way back through the enemy, though a party of the 2nd Battalion Seaforth Highlanders, 4th Division, remained cut off at Rœux until successfully withdrawn during the night.

On the southern portion of his attack the enemy's repulse was, if possible, even more complete than on the new front east of Arras. Attacks on the Guards Division and on the 31st Division were defeated after all-day fighting. The 42nd Division drove off two attacks from the direction of Ablainzevelle, and the 62nd Division, with an attached brigade of the 4th

Australian Division, also beat off a succession of heavy attacks about Bucquoy with great loss to the enemy.

Less important attacks at different points between Hebuterne and Dernancourt were in each case repulsed, and led to the capture of a number of prisoners by our troops.

(46) With this day's battle, which ended in the complete defeat of the enemy on the whole front of his attack, the first stage of the enemy's offensive weakened and eventually closed on April 5. During these days hostile pressure continued south of the Somme, and after much fierce and fluctuating fighting in this area, accompanied by a number of strong local attacks also on the northern portion of the battle front, the enemy on April 4 and 5 made final unsuccessful efforts to overcome the resistance of the Allies. These attacks, however, though formidable, lacked the weight that had made his earlier successes possible, while the strength of the Allied positions increased from day to day.

During the night of March 28-29 our outpost line between Arleux-en-Gohelle and Avion was withdrawn to conform to our positions farther south. Except at minor points no further ground was gained by the enemy north of the Somme; while by successful local operations on March 30 and the night of April 2-3, the New Zealand Division advanced their line at Hebuterne, capturing 250 prisoners and over 100 machine-guns, and the 32nd Division, under command of Major-General C. D. Shute, C.B., C.M.G., retook Ayette with 192 prisoners. A number of prisoners were taken by us also in local fighting at other points.

(47) During these latter days the problem south of the Somme was to disengage the divisions which had been fighting since March 21, and give them an opportunity to reorganise. Profiting by the great weariness of our troops, the enemy was making progress by local attacks rather than by general attacks in force, and there is little doubt that, had it been possible to put in fresh troops a few days earlier, the enemy's advance could have been stopped and even turned back without much difficulty.

The divisions of the III. Corps, which had already been heavily engaged, were on their way to reinforce our line. These troops, however, had not yet arrived, and on March 29 the greater part of the British front south of the Somme was held by Carey's force assisted by the 1st Cavalry Division and such troops of the divisions originally engaged as it had not yet been found possible to withdraw. In rear of these troops a few of the divisions of the Fifth Army were given a brief opportunity to reassemble.

Hostile pressure recommenced during the morning of March 29 from Demuin southwards, and in spite of vigorous counter-attacks our troops and the French were forced back from Mézières.

During the night the enemy established a footing in Moreuil Wood, and on the following morning attacked on both sides of the River Luce. Our line in Moreuil Wood was restored by a brilliant counter-attack carried out by the Canadian Cavalry Brigade supported by the 3rd Cavalry Brigade, but the enemy gained possession of Demuin. North of the Luce also the enemy made some progress, but in the afternoon was held up and finally driven back into Aubercourt by counter-attacks carried out by troops of the 66th Division and the 3rd Australian Division, Major-General Sir

J. Monash, K.C.B., commanding the latter division. In this operation a squadron of the 2nd Cavalry Division co-operated very finely. In the evening a most successful counter-attack by troops of the 20th and 50th Divisions re-established our line south of the Luce and captured a number of prisoners.

Other hostile attacks on both banks of the Somme were repulsed with heavy loss to the enemy by the 1st Cavalry Division and the 3rd Australian Division, a battalion of United States Engineers rendering gallant service south of the river.

The fighting between the Avre and the Luce continued during the evening of this day, and in the afternoon of March 31 developed into strong attacks between Moreuil and Demuin. Powerful assaults were delivered also on the French front as far south as Montdidier. In both cases the enemy made progress after heavy fighting, at the close of which troops of the 8th Division carried out a successful counter-attack, thereby considerably improving the situation west of Moreuil Wood. At the end of the day our line ran from Moreuil Station to Hangard, and thence to our old line west of Warfusée-Abancourt.

On the following morning troops of the 2nd Cavalry Division and of the 8th Division again attacked, and as the result of a very gallant action effected a further improvement in our positions in this neighbourhood. On April 2, for the first time since the opening of the enemy's offensive, no attack took place on the British front south of the Somme.

(48) On April 4 and 5 the enemy made a final effort to prevent the French and British line from becoming stable.

The principal attack on April 4 was made south of the Somme, and involved the whole of the British front between the river and Hangard, where we joined the French, and also the French Army on our right. The first assault, delivered at 7 A.M., after a comparatively short bombardment, was completely repulsed on the right of our line, but on the left obliged our troops to fall back to the west of Hamel and Vaire Wood. During the afternoon the enemy again attacked heavily on the right, and caused our line to be withdrawn a short distance in the neighbourhood of Hangard Wood.

The enemy attacked in dense formation, and his infantry afforded excellent targets for our artillery and machine-guns. Particularly heavy losses were inflicted on the enemy by the artillery of the 3rd Australian Division, on the north bank of the Somme, which engaged his troops across the river over open sights with excellent effect.

The attack on the French front succeeded in making some progress on both sides of the Avre River.

On April 5 the principal German effort was made north of the Somme, the enemy attacking heavily on practically the whole front from Dernancourt to beyond Bucquoy. Strong local attacks were made also south of the Somme about Hangard, where the French and British troops had severe fighting until late in the day, and in the sector immediately south of the river, where the attacking German infantry were stopped by our artillery and machine-gun fire.

North of the river, except for minor readjustments of our line at certain points, particularly in the neighbourhood of Bucquoy, where he gained

the eastern portion of the village, the enemy's efforts were entirely without result. His troops, held or driven back at all points, lost heavily, and any hope that he may have entertained of opening the road to Amiens at the eleventh hour ended in an exceedingly costly repulse.

In the neighbourhood of Rossignol Wood the enemy's attack was entirely disorganised by a local attack carried out at a somewhat earlier hour by the 37th Division, under command of Major-General H. B. Williams, C.B., D.S.O., as the result of which our positions were improved and over 130 prisoners captured by us.

With the failure of his attacks on April 4 and 5 the enemy's offensive on the Somme battle front ceased for the time being, and conditions rapidly began to approximate to the normal type of trench warfare, broken only by occasional local attacks on either side.

(49) Though the enemy's progress had been stopped, this result had been obtained only by the sacrifice of a very considerable area of ground and by a great expenditure of reserves. This latter factor was to have a material influence upon the course of the subsequent fighting on the northern portion of the British front. Before passing, therefore, to the operations on the Lys, it will be convenient to give some account of the causes to which the retirement on the Fifth Army front and the right of the Third Army can be attributed.

(i) In the first place, the forces at the disposal of the Fifth Army were inadequate to meet and hold an attack in such strength as that actually delivered by the enemy on its front.

The reason for this state of affairs has already been pointed out in paragraph 9 of this report, in which the relative importance of the various portions of the line held by the British Army was explained. The extent of our front made it impossible, with the forces under my command, to have adequate reserves at all points threatened. It was therefore necessary to ensure the safety of certain sectors which were vital, and to accept risks at others.

In certain sectors, particularly in the northern and central portions of my front, it was of vital importance that no ground should be given up to the enemy. In the southern sector alone it was possible under extreme pressure to give ground to some extent without serious consequences, over the area devastated by the enemy in his retreat in the spring of 1917. The troops holding this latter part of the front could fall back to meet their reinforcements, which need not necessarily be pushed forward so far or so rapidly as elsewhere. Moreover, the southern sector could be reinforced with French troops more easily than any other portion of the British line. I therefore considered it unsound to maintain a considerable force of reserves south of the River Somme, while it was yet unknown where and to what extent the enemy would commit his reserves.

The Fifth Army was instructed early in February to act accordingly, both in regard to defensive preparations on the ground and in the actual conduct of the defence.

(ii) The front south of the River Omignon was taken over by the British only some seven weeks before the enemy's attack, a period insufficient to ensure that the scheme of defence would be in an efficient state of preparation. During the winter it had been possible to hold the defences

in this sector very lightly, and they were consequently in themselves inadequate to meet any serious form of attack.

Much work, therefore, had to be carried out by the Fifth Army, and strenuous efforts were made with such resources as were available to improve the defences as rapidly as possible. Great difficulties, however, were met with in the devastated area. The roads were in a bad condition, there was no light railway system, the broad-gauge system was deficient, and there was a serious lack of accommodation for the troops. The amount of labour at our disposal being limited, all available labour units in rear of the forward defensive zones were allotted to the construction of the Péronne bridgehead defences, which were considered of primary importance, with the result that practically no work had been carried out with the object of securing the line of the River Somme itself.

(iii) The thick fog which enveloped the battle-field on the mornings of March 21 and 22 undoubtedly masked the fire of artillery, rifles, and machine-guns. Where the troops on the ground were more numerous this was not of such extreme importance, but where the defences were more lightly held, as in the southern sector of the Fifth Army front, and depended for their maintenance on the cross fire of artillery and machine-guns, the masking of our fire enabled the enemy to penetrate and turn the flanks of certain important localities.

(iv) On the extreme right the valley of the River Oise, normally marshy and almost impassable during the early spring, was, owing to the exceptionally dry weather, passable for infantry almost everywhere, and formed no serious obstacle. This applies equally to the valley of the River Somme, which in the latter stage of the battle was easily negotiated by the hostile infantry between the recognised points of passage. A much larger number of troops would therefore have been required to render the defence of these rivers secure. These forces, however, were not available except at the expense of other and more vital portions of my front, and as the exceptional weather conditions could not have been foreseen by the enemy at the time when the preparations for his offensive were undertaken, there was a strong possibility that he would not be able to take advantage of them.

(v) For some time prior to March 21 it was known that the enemy had been making extensive preparations for an offensive on the Reims front, and that these preparations were already far advanced. As pointed out above, the bombardment on the battle front had been accompanied by great artillery activity on both sides of Reims. It could not be determined with certainty that this was a feint until the attack upon the British had been in progress for some days. The enemy might have employed a portion of his reserves in this sector, and the knowledge of this possibility necessarily influenced the distribution and utilisation of the French reserves.

(50) The possibility of a German attack north of La Bassée Canal, for which certain preparations appeared to have been carried out, had been brought to my notice prior to March 21. Indications that preparations for a hostile attack in this sector were nearing completion had been observed in the first days of April, but its extent and force could not be accurately gauged.

There were obvious advantages for the enemy in such a course of

action. In the first place, the depth of his advance on the southern portion of the battle front had left him with a long and dangerously exposed flank between Noyon and Montdidier. The absence of properly organised communications in the battle area made this flank peculiarly vulnerable to a counter-stroke by the French. To prevent this, and preserve the initiative in his hands, it was essential that he should renew his attack without delay.

In the second place, the heavy and prolonged struggle on the Somme had placed a severe strain on the forces under my command and had absorbed the whole of my reserves. Further, to meet the urgent demands of the battle, I had been forced to withdraw ten divisions from the northern portion of my line, and to replace them by divisions exhausted in the Somme fighting, which had only just been made up with reinforcements recently sent out from home. The divisions thus withdrawn had been taken chiefly from the Flanders front, where, in a normal year, the condition of the ground could be relied upon to make offensive operations on a large scale impossible before May at the earliest.

A strong additional reason for drawing these divisions principally from the North was furnished by conditions on the central portion of my front between the Scarpe and the La Bassée Canal. Should urgent necessity arise it would be possible to give ground to a limited extent in the North, while still preserving strong lines of defence, which could in part be covered by inundations. On the other hand, a break through on our centre, about Vimy, would mean the realisation of the enemy's plan which had been foiled by our defence at Arras on March 28—namely, the capture of Amiens and the separation of the bulk of the British Armies from the French and from those British forces acting under the direction of the latter.

The enemy's preparations for an offensive in this central sector, the extreme importance of which will readily be understood, had been complete for some time. The admirable and extensive railway system serving it made it possible for him to effect with great rapidity at any moment the concentration of troops necessary for an attack. My own forces in this sector, therefore, could not greatly be reduced.

In consequence of these different factors, the bulk of the divisions in front line in the northern battle, and in particular the 40th, 34th, 25th, 19th, and 9th Divisions which on April 9 held the portion of my front between the Portuguese sector and the Ypres-Comines Canal, had already taken part in the southern battle. It must be remembered that before the northern battle commenced forty-six out of my total force of fifty-eight divisions had been engaged in the southern area.

At the end of March, however, the northern front was rapidly drying up under the influence of the exceptionally rainless spring, and, in view of the indications referred to, the possibility of an early attack in this sector became a matter for immediate consideration. Arrangements for the relief of the Portuguese divisions, which had been continuously in line for a long period and needed rest, were therefore undertaken during the first week of April, and were to have been completed by the morning of April 10. Meanwhile, other divisions which had been engaged in the Somme fighting, and had been withdrawn to rest and reorganise, were

moved up behind the Lys front. Arrangements had already been made for the evacuation of the salient at Passchendaele should circumstances require it, a measure which would both upset any preparations which the enemy might have made for an offensive there and economise a few troops for use elsewhere.

The steps which I could take, however, to meet a danger which I could foresee were limited by the fact that, though the enemy's progress on the Somme had for the time being been stayed, the great mass of hostile divisions still concentrated on that front constituted a threat to the safety of the British Armies of an imperative character. The enemy was in a position to take immediate advantage of any weakening of my forces in that area.

(51) The persistence of unseasonably fine weather and the rapid drying up of the low-lying ground in the Lys Valley enabled the enemy to anticipate the relief of the 2nd Portuguese Division.

On the night of April 7 an unusually heavy and prolonged bombardment with gas shell was opened along practically the whole front from Lens to Armentières. At about 4 A.M. on April 9 the bombardment recommenced with the greatest intensity with both gas and high explosive shell.

The enemy's attack in the first instance was launched on the northern portion of the front of General Sir H. S. Horne's First Army, held by the XI. and XV. Corps under command respectively of Lieut.-General Sir R. C. R. Haking, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., and Lieut.-General Sir J. P. Du Cane, K.C.B. On April 10 the right of General Sir H. C. O. Plumer's Second Army, held by the IX. Corps under command of Lieut.-General Sir A. Hamilton Gordon, K.C.B., was also involved. In the early stages of the battle the XV. Corps was transferred to the Second Army, and at later dates the extension of the battle front led to the intervention of the I. Corps, under command of Lieut.-General Sir Arthur Holland, K.C.B., M.V.O., D.S.O., on the First Army front, and of the XXII. Corps, under command of Lieut.-General Sir A. J. Godley, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., on the Second Army front. Subsequently the II. Corps of the Second Army, under command of Lieut.-General Sir C. W. Jacob, K.C.B., became involved in the withdrawal from the Passchendaele salient.

At about 7 A.M. on April 9, in thick fog which again made observation impossible, the enemy appears to have attacked the left brigade of the 2nd Portuguese Division in strength and to have broken into their trenches. A few minutes afterwards the area of attack spread south and north. Shortly after 7 A.M. the right brigade of the 40th Division reported that an attack had developed on their front and was being held, but that machine-guns near their right-hand post could see the enemy moving rapidly through the sector to the south of them.

Communication with the divisions in line was difficult, but during the morning the situation cleared up, and it became apparent that a serious attack was in progress on the front of the 55th Division, under command of Major-General H. S. Jeudwine, C.B., and of the 2nd Portuguese and 40th Divisions from the La Bassée Canal to Bois Grenier. Meanwhile, shortly after the opening of the bombardment, orders had been given to the 51st and 50th Divisions to move up behind Richebourg-St. Vaast and

Laventie and take up their positions in accordance with the pre-arranged defence scheme. Both these divisions had also been heavily engaged in the Somme battle, and had but recently arrived in the neighbourhood. The 1st King Edward's Horse and the 11th Cyclist Battalion had been sent forward at once to cover their deployment.

Between 8 A.M. and 9 A.M. the enemy succeeded in occupying the forward posts of the right battalion of the 40th Division and attacked northwards along the Rue Petillon and Rue de Bois. Our machine-gun posts in this area continued to fight until all but one of their machine-guns were destroyed, and by their fire greatly delayed his progress. At 10.15 A.M., however, his troops were already in Rouge de Bout, more than 2,000 yards in rear of the headquarters of the 40th Division's right battalion, which, at this hour, were still holding out at Petillon. Later in the morning the 40th Division was pushed back by pressure on its front and flank to a position facing south between Bois Grenier, Fleurbaix, and Sailly-sur-Lys, its right brigade in particular having lost heavily.

South of the Portuguese sector the 55th Division was heavily attacked on its whole front, and by 10.30 A.M. its left brigade had been forced back from its outpost line. The main line of resistance was intact, and a defensive flank was formed facing north between Festubert and a strong point just south of Le Touret, where touch was established later with troops of the 51st Division.

Throughout the remainder of the day the 55th Division maintained its positions against all assaults, and by successful counter-attacks captured over 750 prisoners. The success of this most gallant defence, the importance of which it would be hard to over-estimate, was due in great measure to the courage and determination displayed by our advanced posts. These held out with the utmost resolution though surrounded, pinning to the ground those parties of the enemy who had penetrated our defences, and preventing them from developing their attack. Among the many gallant deeds recorded of them, one instance is known of a machine-gun which was kept in action although the German infantry had entered the rear compartment of the "pill-box" from which it was firing, the gun team holding up the enemy by revolver fire from the inner compartment.

To the north of the positions held by the 55th Division, the weight and impetus of the German attack overwhelmed the Portuguese troops, and the enemy's progress was so rapid that the arrangements for manning the rear defences of this sector with British troops could scarcely be completed in time.

The 1st King Edward's Horse and the 11th Cyclist Battalion, indeed, occupied Lacouture, Vieille Chapelle, and Huit Maisons, and by their splendid defence of those places enabled troops of the 51st and 50th Divisions to come into action east of the Lawe River between Le Touret and Estaires. East of Estaires our troops found the enemy already in possession of the right bank of the river, and touch between the 50th and 40th Divisions could not be established. After heavy fighting the right of the 40th Division was forced back upon the Lys, and early in the afternoon withdrew across the river at Bac St. Maur.

The remainder of the 40th Division, reinforced by troops of the 34th Division, established themselves in a position covering the approaches to

Erquinghem and Armentières, between Fort Rompu on the Lys and our old front line north-east of Bois Grenier. Here they successfully maintained themselves, although the line was not readily defensible, and was constantly attacked. In this fighting very gallant service was rendered by the 12th Battalion Suffolk Regiment, 40th Division, who held out in Fleurbaix until the evening, though heavily attacked on three sides.

During the afternoon troops of the 51st and 50th Divisions (chiefly composed of drafts hurriedly sent up to join their regiments) were heavily engaged east of the Lawe River and were gradually pressed back upon the river crossings. The enemy brought up guns to close range and in the evening crossed at Estaires and Pont Riqueul, but in both cases was driven back by counter-attacks. At the end of the day the bridgeheads were still held by us as far east as Sailly-sur-la-Lys.

In the course of the night our troops at Estaires and in the sector to the south were withdrawn to the left bank of the Lawe and Lys Rivers, after sharp fighting about Pont Riqueul. The bridges across both rivers were blown up, though, as had been the case in the Somme battle, in some instances their destruction was incomplete.

(52) East of Sailly-sur-la-Lys the enemy had followed closely the troops of the 40th Division who had crossed at Bac St. Maur and, though here also the bridge had been blown up, at about 3 P.M., succeeded in passing small parties across the river by an emergency bridge, under cover of machine-gun fire. During the remainder of the afternoon and evening the strength of his forces north of the river steadily increased, and pushing northwards they reached Croix du Bac. At this point they were counter-attacked early in the night by a brigade of the 25th Division and pressed back. Our troops were unable, however, to clear the German infantry completely from the village, and during the night the enemy established himself firmly on the north bank of the river.

(53) Early in the morning of April 10 the enemy launched heavy attacks covered by artillery fire about the river crossings at Lestrem and Estaires, and succeeded in reaching the left bank at both places; but in each case he was driven back again by determined counter-attacks by the 50th Division.

The enemy continued to exercise great pressure at Estaires, and fierce street fighting took place in which both sides lost heavily. Machine-guns, mounted by our troops in the upper rooms of houses, did great execution on his troops as they moved up to the attack, until the machine-guns were knocked out by artillery fire. In the evening the German infantry once more forced their way into Estaires, and after a most gallant resistance the 50th Division withdrew at nightfall to a prepared position to the north and west of the town.

East of Estaires the enemy had already crossed the Lys in strength, with artillery in close support of his infantry, and by the evening had pressed back our troops to a position north of Steenwerck. Thereafter, the arrival of British reinforcements for the time being held up his advance.

(54) Meanwhile, after an intense bombardment of our front and support lines and battery areas between Frelinghien and Hill 60, strong hostile attacks had developed at about 5.30 A.M. in this sector also.

The outpost positions of the 25th and 19th Divisions in line north of

Armentières and east of Messines were driven in, and during the morning the enemy worked his way forward under cover of mist along the valleys of the Warnave and Douve Rivers, on the flanks of our positions in Ploegsteert Wood and Messines. By midday he had gained Ploegsteert Village, together with the south-eastern portions of Ploegsteert Wood, and had captured Messines. North of that village the area of attack extended during the afternoon as far as the north bank of the Ypres-Comines Canal. In this new sector the enemy carried our forward positions as far as Hollebeke, pushing back our line to the crest of the Wytschaete Ridge.

Messines was retaken early in the afternoon by the South African Brigade, 9th Division. During the night this division cleared Wytschaete of parties of German troops. North of Hollebeke our positions astride the Ypres-Comines Canal were substantially unchanged, and on this front the 9th Division killed great numbers of the enemy.

(55) The enemy's advance north of Armentières made the position of the 34th Division in that town very dangerous. Though it had not yet been attacked on its own front, its available reserves had already been heavily engaged in protecting its southern flank. As the northern flank also had now become exposed, it was decided to withdraw the division to the left bank of the Lys. The early stages of the movement were commenced shortly after midday. Though the operation was closely followed up by the enemy and pressed by him on all sides, it was carried out with great steadiness and in good order, and by 9.30 P.M. had been completed successfully. All the bridges across the river were destroyed.

(56) On the morning of April 11 the enemy recommenced his attacks on the whole front, and again made progress. Between Givenchy and the Lawe River the successful resistance of the past two days was maintained against repeated assaults. Between Locon and Estaires the enemy, on the previous evening, had established a footing on the west bank of the river in the neighbourhood of Fosse. In this area and northwards to Lestrem he continued to push westwards, despite the vigorous resistance of our troops.

At Estaires the troops of the 5th Division, tired and reduced in numbers by the exceptionally heavy fighting of the previous three weeks and threatened on their right flank by the enemy's advance south of the Lys, were heavily engaged. After holding their positions with great gallantry during the morning, they were slowly pressed back in the direction of Merville.

The enemy employed large forces on this front in close formation, and the losses inflicted by our rifle and machine-gun fire were unusually heavy. Our own troops, however, were not in sufficient numbers to hold up his advance, and as they fell back and their front gradually extended, gaps formed in the line. Through these gaps bodies of German infantry worked their way forward, and at 6 P.M. had reached Neuf Berquin. Other parties of the enemy pushed on along the north bank of the Lys Canal and entered Merville. As it did not appear possible to clear the town without fresh forces, which were not yet available, it was decided to withdraw behind the small stream which runs just west of the town. This withdrawal was successfully carried out during the evening.

(57) Heavy fighting took place on the remainder of the front south of

Armentières, and the enemy made some progress. In this sector, however, certain reinforcements had come into action, and in the evening a counter-attack carried out by troops of the 31st Division, recently arrived from the southern battle-field, regained the hamlets of Le Verrier and La Becque.

Meanwhile, north of Armentières strong hostile attacks had developed towards midday and were pressed vigorously in the direction of Nieppe and Neuve Eglise. In the afternoon fierce fighting took place about Messines, which the enemy had regained. Beyond this, his troops were not able to push their advance, being checked and driven back by a counter-attack by the South African Brigade. South of Hollebeke the 9th Division had again been heavily attacked during the morning, but had held their positions.

Owing to the progress made by the enemy in the Ploegsteert sector, the position of the 34th Division at Nieppe, where they had beaten off a determined attack during the morning, became untenable. Accordingly, in the early part of the night our troops at Nieppe fell back under orders to the neighbourhood of Pont d'Achelles. Still further to shorten our line and economise men, our troops between Pont d'Achelles and Wytschaete were withdrawn to positions about 1,000 yards east of Neuve Eglise and Wulverghem. The withdrawal involved the abandonment of Hill 63 and of the positions still held by us about Messines.

(58) Though our troops had not been able to prevent the enemy's entry into Merville, their vigorous resistance, combined with the maintenance of our positions at Givenchy and Festubert, had given an opportunity for reinforcements to build up our line in this sector. As troops of the 3rd, 4th, 5th, 31st, 61st, and 1st Australian Divisions began to arrive, the southern portion of the battle front gradually became steady. Time was still required, however, to complete our dispositions, and for the next two days the situation in this area remained critical.

A sudden attack just before dawn on April 12 broke through the left centre of the 51st Division about Pacaut and Riez du Vinage, and but for the gallantry and resource of two batteries of the 255th Brigade, R.F.A., commanded respectively by Major L. N. Davidson, D.S.O., and Major F. C. Jack, M.C., might have enabled the enemy to cross the La Bassée Canal. Each of these batteries as it retired left a gun within 500 yards of the canal, and, assisted by a party of gunners who held the drawbridge with rifles, worked with them to such good purpose that the enemy's advance was stopped. The 3rd Division was already in action on the right of the 51st Division about Locon where, though forced to fall back a short distance, our troops inflicted very heavy casualties upon an enemy greatly superior in numbers. On the left of the 51st Division, the 61st Division was coming into action about the Clarence River. Both the 3rd and the 61st Divisions had been engaged in many days of continuous fighting south of Arras; but with the arrival of these troops, battle-weary though they were, the enemy's progress in this sector of the front was definitely checked.

At Merville also, our troops, though compelled to give ground somewhat during the morning, thereafter maintained themselves successfully.

(59) Meanwhile, a situation which threatened to become serious had

arisen north of Merville. At about 8 A.M. the enemy attacked in great strength on a front extending from south of the Estaires-Vieux Berquin Road to the neighbourhood of Steenwerck. After very heavy fighting, in the course of which the 1st Battalion Royal Guernsey/Light Infantry, 29th Division, Major-General D. E. Cayley, C.M.G., commanding the division, did gallant service, he succeeded in the afternoon in overcoming the resistance of our troops about Doulieu and La Becque, forcing them back in a north-westerly direction. As the result of this movement, a gap was formed in our line south-west of Bailleul, and bodies of the enemy who had forced their way through seized Outtersteene and Merris.

In the evening a brigade of the 33rd Division, Major-General R. J. Pinney, C.B., commanding the division, with a body of Cyclists, a Pioneer battalion, and every available man from schools and reinforcement camps, came into action in this sector. On their left, troops of the 25th, 34th, and 49th Divisions, Major-General N. J. G. Cameron, C.B., C.M.G., commanding the last-mentioned division, though heavily attacked, maintained their positions to the south and south-east of Bailleul, and before midnight our line had been reformed.

Next day the enemy followed up his attacks with great vigour, and the troops of the 29th and 31st Divisions, now greatly reduced in strength by the severe fighting already experienced and strung out over a front of nearly 10,000 yards east of the Forêt de Nieppe, were once more tried to the utmost. Behind them the 1st Australian Division, under command of Major-General Sir H. B. Walker, K.C.B., D.S.O., was in process of detraining, and the troops were told that the line was to be held at all costs, until the detraining could be completed.

During the morning, which was very foggy, several determined attacks, in which a German armoured car came into action against the 4th Guards Brigade on the southern portion of our line, were repulsed with great loss to the enemy. After the failure of these assaults, he brought up field-guns to point-blank range, and in the northern sector with their aid gained Vieux Berquin. Everywhere except at Vieux Berquin the enemy's advance was held up all day by desperate fighting, in which our advanced posts displayed the greatest gallantry, maintaining their ground when entirely surrounded, men standing back to back in the trenches and shooting to front and rear.

In the afternoon the enemy made a further determined effort, and by sheer weight of numbers forced his way through the gaps in our depleted line, the surviving garrisons of our posts fighting where they stood to the last with bullet and bayonet. The heroic resistance of these troops, however, had given the leading brigades of the 1st Australian Division time to reach and organise their appointed line east of the Forêt de Nieppe. These now took up the fight and the way to Hazebrouck was definitely closed.

The performance of all the troops engaged in this most gallant stand, and especially that of the 4th Guards Brigade, on whose front of some 4,000 yards the heaviest attacks fell, is worthy of the highest praise. No more brilliant exploit has taken place since the opening of the enemy's offensive, though gallant actions have been without number.

The action of these troops, and indeed of all the divisions engaged in

the fighting in the Lys Valley, is the more noteworthy because, as already pointed out, practically the whole of them had been brought straight out of the Somme battle-field, where they had suffered severely and had been subjected to a great strain. All these divisions, without adequate rest and filled with young reinforcements which they had had no time to assimilate, were again hurriedly thrown into the fight, and, in spite of the great disadvantages under which they laboured, succeeded in holding up the advance of greatly superior forces of fresh troops. Such an accomplishment reflects the greatest credit on the youth of Great Britain, as well as upon those responsible for the training of the young soldiers sent out from home at this time.

(60) On the afternoon of April 12 sharp fighting had taken place in the neighbourhood of Neuve Eglise, and during the night the enemy's pressure in this sector had been maintained and extended. By the morning of April 13 his troops had forced their way into the village, but before noon were driven out by troops of the 33rd and 49th Divisions by a most successful counter-attack in which a number of prisoners were taken.

In the course of this day also a succession of heavy attacks were driven off with great loss to the enemy by the 33rd and 34th Divisions about Meteren and La Crèche. In the evening further attacks developed on this front and at Neuve Eglise. The pressure exercised by the enemy was very great, and bodies of German Infantry, having forced their way in between La Crèche and Neuve Eglise, began a strong encircling movement against the left of the 34th Division north and east of the former village. During the early part of the night our troops maintained their positions, but before dawn on April 14 withdrew under orders to a line in front of the high ground known as the Ravelsburg Heights between Bailleul and Neuve Eglise, the enemy having been too severely handled to interfere.

At Neuve Eglise the enemy again forced his way into the village, and heavy and confused fighting took place throughout the night. A party of the 2nd Battalion Worcestershire Regiment, 33rd Division, maintained themselves in the Mairie until 2 P.M. on April 14, and during the morning of this day other troops of the same division were reported to have cleared the village with bombs. The enemy persisted in his attacks, however, and by midnight Neuve Eglise was definitely in his possession. Other attacks delivered on April 14 between Neuve Eglise and Bailleul and south-east of Meteren were repulsed.

Farther south local fighting had taken place meanwhile both on April 13 and 14 at a number of points between Givenchy and the Forêt de Nieppe. In these encounters the enemy had met with no success. On the other hand, a local operation carried out by the 4th Division on the evening of April 14 resulted in the recapture of Riez du Vinage with 150 prisoners.

(61) On the morning of April 15 the 19th Division repulsed hostile attacks about Wyttschaete. Late in the afternoon fresh assaults in great strength, in which the Alpine Corps and two other fresh German divisions were engaged, developed against Bailleul and the Ravelsburg Heights. After heavy fighting the enemy gained a footing on the eastern end of the high ground and, though driven back by a counter-attack, re-established his position there and worked west along the ridge. By 7 P.M. the whole

of it was in his possession, and the retention of Bailleul itself became very difficult. Two hours later hostile infantry forced their way into the town, and our troops, who were being heavily attacked from the east and south, were compelled to fall back to positions between Meteren and Dranoutre.

(62) In order to set free additional British troops for the battle and to delay the execution of any plans which the enemy might be entertaining for extending the flank of his attack to the north, I approved of putting into execution the scheme for the gradual evacuation of the Ypres salient. The first stage in this withdrawal had been carried out on the night of April 12-13, since which date our positions of the Passchendaele Ridge had been held by outposts only. On the night of April 15-16 the withdrawal was carried a stage further, our troops taking up positions along the line of the Steenbeek River and the Westhoek and Wytschaete Ridges.

(63) The constant and severe fighting on the Lys battle front, following so closely upon the tremendous struggle south of Arras, had placed a very serious strain upon the British forces. Many British divisions had taken part both in the northern and southern battles, while others had been engaged almost continuously from the outset of the German offensive. I had represented the state of affairs to General Foch, Commanding-in-Chief the Allied Forces, and had pointed out to him the necessity of relief for the British troops and their need of an opportunity to rest and refit. General Foch had complied with my request without delay. Certain French forces were moved to the north, and by this date were already in position close behind the British front in Flanders.

(64) At different times on April 16 a number of strong local attacks were made by the enemy on the Meteren-Wytschaete front, which were for the most part repulsed with heavy loss to him by the 25th, 34th, and 49th Divisions. At Meteren and Wytschaete, however, he succeeded in penetrating our positions, and after much rather confused fighting established himself in both villages. Counter-attacks delivered during the evening by British and French troops failed to eject him, though at Wytschaete a battalion of the 9th Division reached the eastern edge of the village, and our line was ultimately established close up to its western and northern outskirts.

These attacks were followed on the morning of April 17 by a determined attempt on the part of the enemy to capture the commanding feature known as Kemmel Hill. The assault was launched after a preliminary bombardment of great intensity, and was accompanied by strong attacks in the Meteren and Merris sectors.

The enemy's attacks in the Kemmel sector were pressed with great determination, but ended in his complete repulse at all points by troops of the 34th, 49th, and 19th Divisions, his infantry being driven out by counter-attacks wherever they had gained a temporary footing in our line. The attacks at Meteren and Merris were also beaten off with heavy loss by the 33rd Division and the 1st Australian Division.

On this day also the enemy launched a strong assault upon the right of the Belgian Army about the Ypres-Staden Railway. This attack, the object of which was to capture Bixschoote and advance beyond the Yser Canal, ended in complete failure, and left over 700 prisoners in the hands of our Allies.

(65) On April 18 the enemy made a fresh effort to overcome our resistance on the southern flank of his attack. After a heavy bombardment which at Givenchy is reported to have exceeded in intensity even the bombardment of April 9, his infantry attacked on nearly the whole front from Givenchy to West of Merville. At Givenchy and Festubert they succeeded at certain points in entering our positions, but after severe and continuous fighting, lasting throughout the day, the troops of the 1st Division, under command of Major-General E. P. Strickland, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., regained by counter-attacks practically the whole of their original positions. Elsewhere the enemy failed to obtain even an initial success, being repulsed with exceedingly heavy loss at all points by the 4th and 61st Divisions.

For nearly a week following the failure of these attacks the battle on the Lys front died down, though sharp fighting of a minor character took place from time to time at different points, particularly in the neighbourhood of Festubert, where a strong point, known as route "A" keep, changed hands more than once before remaining finally in our possession. Farther west the 4th Division, in co-operation with the 61st Division, carried out a series of successful local operations north of the La Bassée Canal, resulting in the capture of some hundreds of prisoners and a considerable improvement of our positions between the Lawe and the Clarence Rivers.

During this period, also, the French troops which had already come into line in the neighbourhood of Meteren and opposite Spanbroekmolen, gradually relieved the British troops between these two points, and by the morning of April 21 had taken over the whole of the Kemmel sector.

(66) Local attacks, meanwhile, had taken place from time to time on both sides of the Somme battle front, particularly in the vicinity of Hangard, where our line linked up with the French, and about Aveluy Wood. On April 23 a more serious attack, in which four German divisions were employed against the British forces alone and German and British tanks came into conflict for the first time, took place on the Allied front between the Somme and the Avre Valleys.

At about 6.30 A.M., after a heavy bombardment lasting about three hours, the enemy advanced to the assault on the whole British front south of the Somme, under cover of fog. In the ensuing struggle German tanks broke through our line south-east of Villers Bretonneux and, turning to north and south, opened the way for their infantry. After heavy fighting, in which great losses were inflicted on his troops both by our infantry fire and by our light tanks, the enemy gained possession of Villers Bretonneux, but was held up on the edge of the wood just west of that place by a counter-attack by the 8th Division. South of Villers Bretonneux some of our heavy tanks came into action, and drove back the German tanks, with the result that the enemy's infantry were stopped some distance to the east of Cachy Village, which formed their objective. North of Villers Bretonneux all attacks were repulsed.

At 10 P.M. on the night of April 23-24 a counter-attack was launched by a Brigade of the 18th Division and the 13th and 15th Brigades of the 4th and 5th Australian Divisions, Major-General Sir J. J. T. Hobbs, K.C.B., commanding the latter division, and met with remarkable success. A night operation of this character, undertaken at such short notice, was an enterprise of great daring. The instant decision to seize the opportunity

offered, and the rapid and thorough working out of the general plan and details of the attack on the part of the III. Corps Commander and divisional and subordinate commanders concerned are most worthy of commendation, while the unusual nature of the operation called for the highest qualities on the part of the troops employed. It was carried out in the most spirited and gallant manner by all ranks. The 13th Australian Brigade, in particular, showed great skill and resolution in their attack, making their way through belts of wire running diagonally to the line of their advance, across very difficult country which they had had no opportunity to reconnoitre beforehand.

At daybreak Villers Bretonneux was practically surrounded by our troops. During the morning two battalions of the 8th Division worked their way through the streets and houses, overcoming the resistance of such parties of the enemy as were still holding out. That afternoon Villers Bretonneux was again completely in our possession. In this well-conceived and brilliantly executed operation nearly 1,000 prisoners were captured by our troops. A German tank was left derelict in our lines and was salvaged subsequently.

(67) These operations on the southern front were followed on April 25 by a renewal of the enemy's attacks in great strength north of the Lys.

Following upon a very violent bombardment, at about 5 A.M. the enemy attacked the French and British positions from Bailleul to the Ypres-Comines Canal with nine divisions, of which five were fresh divisions, and one other had been but lightly engaged. The main object of the attack was the capture of Kemmel Hill by a direct assault upon the French, combined with an attack upon the British right south of Wytschaete, aimed at turning the British right flank and separating it from the French. At that date the British right flank lay on the Messines-Kemmel road, at a point about half-way between Kemmel and Wytschaete.

After very heavy fighting the German infantry worked their way round the lower slopes of the high ground, and at 10 A.M. had succeeded in capturing Kemmel Village and Hill; though elements of French troops held out until a late hour on the hill and in the village.

The weight of the attack in the British sector fell on the 9th Division and attached troops of the 49th Division, who at 7 A.M. were still holding their position about Wytschaete intact, though heavily engaged. Fierce fighting continued in this neighbourhood for some hours later, and great numbers of Germans were killed by rifle and machine-gun fire at short range. Later in the morning the right of the 9th Division was forced to fall back fighting stubbornly to Vierstraat, but at 1 P.M. our troops still held the Grand Bois north of Wytschaete.

In the afternoon the attack spread northwards along the front held by the 21st Division. By the evening our troops had been gradually pushed back from their forward positions, and held a line running from Hill 60 to Voormezele, when it passed north of Vierstraat to our junction with the French about La Clytte. The Allied line had not been broken, and reinforcements were hurrying up.

Next day fighting continued fiercely. In the early morning a very gallant counter-attack by the 25th Division, with attached troops of the

21st and 49th Divisions, undertaken in conjunction with the French, penetrated into Kemmel Village, taking over 300 prisoners. Our troops then found themselves exposed to heavy machine-gun fire from the flanks, and were unable to maintain their positions.

Later in the morning the enemy renewed his attacks in strength, but in spite of repeated efforts was only able to make small progress at certain points. Troops of the 21st, 30th, 39th, and 49th Divisions (Major-General C. A. Blacklock, C.M.G., D.S.O., commanding the 39th Division), and the South African Brigade of the 9th Division, had heavy fighting, and made several gallant counter-attacks. It will not have been forgotten that each of the 21st, 30th, and 39th Divisions had experienced severe and prolonged fighting in the battle of the Somme.

Successful counter-attacks were carried out also by the French, in the course of which the village of Loere was recaptured in a very gallant action.

The capture of Kemmel Hill seriously threatened our position in the Ypres salient, the communications and southern defences of which were now under direct observation by the enemy, while his continued progress to the north-west in the Voormezeele sector would make the extrication of troops east of Ypres most hazardous. A further readjustment of our lines in the salient was accordingly carried out on the night of April 26-27, our troops withdrawing to the general line Pilckem—Wieltje—west end of Zillebeke Lake—Voormezeele.

(68) On April 28 local fighting took place in the neighbourhood of Loere and Voormezeele without material change in the situation; but on the following day, encouraged by the capture of Kemmel Hill, the enemy made a determined effort to improve his success.

After a bombardment of exceptional intensity, which started at 3.10 A.M., a series of strong attacks were launched about 5 A.M. against the French and British positions from west of Dranoutre to Voormezeele. Very heavy fighting rapidly developed on the whole of this front, and ended in the complete repulse of the enemy with the heaviest losses to his troops.

At Loere and to the north of that village the enemy made desperate attempts to overcome the resistance of our Allies and gain possession of the high ground known as the Scherpenberg. At one time parties of his troops entered Loere and penetrated to the cross roads between the Scherpenberg and Mont Rouge, but in both localities successful French counter-attacks drove him out after bitter fighting.

On the British front the positions held by the 21st, 49th, and 25th Divisions were strongly attacked between 5 A.M. and 5.30 A.M. On the failure of these attacks bodies of German infantry advanced at 6 A.M. in mass formation, with bayonets fixed, against the 49th Division, and were repulsed with the heaviest losses. The 25th Division was again attacked at 8.35 A.M., and during the morning repeated attacks were made without result on this division and the 49th Division, as well as on the 21st Division and attached troops of the 30th and 39th Divisions. At all points the attack was pressed vigorously with massed bodies of troops, and the losses suffered by the German infantry were very great. Throughout the whole of the fighting our infantry and artillery fought magnificently, and in more than one instance our troops went out to meet the German attack and drove back the enemy with the bayonet.

At the end of the day, except for a small loss of ground about Voor-mezele, our line was intact, and the enemy had undergone a severe and decided check.

In concert with this operation the Belgian positions astride the Ypres-Staden Railway were again attacked, and once more vigorous counter-attacks by Belgian troops promptly ejected the German infantry from such ground as had been gained by them in their first assault. Here also the enemy's failure was complete.

On April 30 the French retook Locre early in the morning, but beyond this no infantry action of importance took place, and the month closed with the enemy definitely held on both the southern and the northern battle fronts.

(69) It has been seen that in the Somme battle, by the end of March, in addition to some ten German divisions engaged against the French, a total of seventy-three German divisions were engaged and fought to a standstill by forty-two British infantry divisions and three cavalry divisions. In order to complete the comparison between the forces engaged, and to enable the nature of the task accomplished by our troops to be realised, it will be of value to give similar figures for the battle of the Lys.

In the Lys battle, prior to April 30 the enemy engaged against the British forces a total of forty-two divisions, of which thirty-three were fresh and nine had fought previously on the Somme. Against these forty-two German divisions twenty-five British divisions were employed, of which eight were fresh and seventeen had taken a prominent part in the Somme battle.

In the six weeks of almost constant fighting, from March 21 to April 30, a total of fifty-five British infantry divisions and three cavalry divisions was employed on the battle fronts against a force of 109 different German divisions. During this period a total of 141 different German divisions were engaged against the combined British and French forces.

(70) The splendid qualities displayed by all ranks and services throughout the Somme and Lys battles make it possible to view with confidence whatever further tests the future may bring.

On March 21 the troops of the Fifth and Third Armies had the glory of sustaining the first and heaviest blow of the German offensive. Though assailed by a concentration of hostile forces which the enemy might well have considered overwhelming, they held up the German attack at all points for the greater part of two days, thereby rendering a service to their country and to the Allied cause the value of which cannot be over-estimated. Thereafter, through many days of heavy and continuous rearguard fighting, they succeeded in presenting a barrier to the enemy's advance until such time as the arrival of British and French reinforcements enabled his progress to be checked.

In the battle of the Lys, as has been pointed out above, many of the same divisions which had just passed through the furnace of the Somme found themselves exposed to the full fury of a second great offensive by fresh German forces. Despite this disadvantage they gave evidence in many days of close and obstinate fighting that their spirit was as high as ever and their courage and determination unabated. Both by them and by the divisions freshly engaged every yard of ground was fiercely disputed,

until troops were overwhelmed or ordered to withdraw. Such withdrawals as were deemed necessary in the course of the battle were carried out successfully and in good order.

At no time, either on the Somme or on the Lys, was there anything approaching a breakdown of command or a failure of *moral*. Under conditions that made rest and sleep impossible for days together, and called incessantly for the greatest physical exertion and quickness of thought, officers and men remained undismayed, realising that for the time being they must play a waiting game and determined to make the enemy pay the full price for the success which for the moment was his.

In the course of this report it has been possible to refer to a very few of the many instances in which officers and men of all arms and services have shown courage and skill of the highest order. On countless other occasions officers and men, of whose names there is no record, have accomplished actions of the greatest valour, while the very nature of the fighting shows that on all parts of the wide battle fronts unknown deeds of heroism were performed without number.

The British infantryman has always had the reputation of fighting his best in an uphill battle, and time and again in the history of our country, by sheer tenacity and determination of purpose, has won victory from a numerically superior foe. Thrown once more upon the defensive by circumstances over which he had no control, but which will not persist, he has shown himself to possess in full measure the traditional qualities of his race.

The part of the artillery in a defensive battle is at once a most important and a most difficult one. The conditions under which guns are fought in trench warfare make a certain loss of material unavoidable when, in a defensive battle, a sudden change takes place to a war of movement. Yet, even in such circumstances, on which, moreover, the affording of artillery support to our infantry till the last moment is of paramount importance, much can be done, and on countless occasions much was done, by swift and resolute action, to prevent guns from falling into the hands of the enemy. The loss of artillery in the series of battles, though considerable, might well have been much greater but for the courage, skill, and resource displayed by all the ranks of the artillery, both heavy and field, and but for the constant efforts made to maintain close co-operation between artillery and infantry.

Of the courage and devotion of the artillery numerous instances could be given, but one example must suffice. On the occasion of the attack east of Arras on March 28, a six-inch howitzer battery was heavily engaged by the enemy's artillery. After all the gun detachments had been either killed or wounded, and all the guns but one had been destroyed, the remaining four officers of the battery continued to serve their last gun, until two of them were killed and the other two wounded.

On the southern battle front, and particularly in the fighting about Noyon, cavalry were once more employed with great effect, and proved their extreme value in warfare of a more open nature. On more than one occasion they were able by rapid and successful action to restore a doubtful situation, while their appearance in the battle gave great encouragement to the infantry.

The work of the Royal Air Force, under command of Major-General J. M. Salmond, C.M.G., D.S.O., in co-operation with the other arms, has been brilliant. Throughout the period of active operations our airmen have established and maintained a superiority over the enemy's air forces without parallel since the days of the first Somme battle. Not content with destroying the enemy in the air, they have vigorously attacked his infantry, guns, and transport with bombs and machine-gun fire, and in fighting south of the Somme in particular gave invaluable assistance to the infantry by these means on numerous occasions. In addition, the usual work of reconnaissance, photography, artillery co-operation, and bombing has been carried out vigorously and with remarkable results.

Reference has been made more than once in the body of this report to the very valuable work accomplished by tanks and tank *personnel* in the course of the Somme battle. Throughout the whole of this fighting tanks took part in numerous successful counter-attacks, many of which were instrumental in checking the enemy's progress at critical points. On these occasions tanks have shown that they possess capabilities in defence little, if at all, less than those which they have already proved in attack. In their first encounter with German tanks officers and men of the tank Corps displayed with success, under conditions new in warfare, the same energy and resource which have always characterised their action.

The experience of the Somme and Lys battles has emphasised once more the great value of the machine-gun in defensive warfare, when handled by brave, skilful, and resolute men. In the course of the recent fighting officers and men of the Machine-Gun Corps have furnished innumerable examples of the utmost resolution, courage, and skill in the use of their weapons. They have been largely instrumental in defeating the enemy's determined efforts to break through, and have inflicted on him very severe losses.

The same conditions of warfare on the battle fronts which handicapped the work of the artillery affected trench mortars in an even greater degree. Despite the disadvantages under which they suffered, the *personnel* of trench mortar batteries of all natures have performed on numberless occasions the most valuable service in the defence of strong points and defended localities, serving their weapons with effect though surrounded by the enemy, and giving the greatest possible assistance to the infantry and machine-gunners.

The work of the Royal Engineers, both during and subsequent to the retreat on the Somme and on the northern battle front, has been particularly arduous. In addition to the heavy demands made upon them in the destruction of roads and bridges and such-like matters during retreat, and the labour entailed in the construction of new positions, they have frequently been called upon to take their place in the firing line. On such occasions their various units have behaved with the greatest steadfastness and courage and in circumstances such as those in which the 251st Tunnelling Company greatly distinguished itself at Givenchy have added to the high reputation of their Service.

In this connexion a generous recognition is due to the gallant conduct of the various composite battalions which on different occasions took their place in the firing line.

During the long periods of active fighting the strain placed upon the Signal Service was immense. The frequent changes of headquarters and the shifting of the line entailed constant labour, frequently attended with great danger, in the maintenance of communications ; while the exigencies of the battle on more than one occasion brought the *personnel* of the signal units into the firing line. The Signal Service met the calls made upon it in a manner wholly admirable, and the efficient performance of its duties was of incalculable value.

On different occasions, and particularly on the Third Army front at the commencement of the German offensive, *personnel* of the Special Brigade (Gas Services) became involved in the infantry battle, and behaved with a like gallantry to that which they have always displayed in the performance of their special duties.

The enormous amount of additional work thrown upon the different branches of my Staff and upon the Administrative Services and Departments by such fighting as that of March and April can readily be imagined. The evacuation of great masses of stores, hospitals, rolling-stock, agricultural implements, non-combatants, labour units, and civilians from the battle area, and the supplying of the troops in constantly changing places with food and ammunition, called for the highest powers of organisation, the most constant forethought and supervision, and the most devoted labour. That all this work was carried out so smoothly and successfully under circumstances of extraordinary difficulty, and that there was never any lack of food or ammunition for the troops, reflects the very highest credit on all concerned.

Upon the Transportation Services, moreover, and particularly upon the omnibus parks, the rapid movement of reserves placed a peculiarly heavy strain, which the different units concerned never failed to meet successfully.

Much additional work, also under circumstances of unusual difficulty and danger, has necessarily been thrown upon the Medical and Nursing Services. The conduct of the Royal Army Medical Corps and Medical Corps of the Overseas Dominions has again been beyond all praise, while the efficient organisation of the medical services as a whole proved itself fully equal to the occasion. I take this opportunity to acknowledge the lasting debt due in this connexion to Lieut.-General Sir A. T. Sloggett, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., K.C.V.O., K.H.S., until recently Director-General of Medical Services, with whom the work of the medical services has so long been identified.

I desire to express my deep appreciation of the loyal and devoted work of the commanders and staffs of all formations of the British Army serving under me in a period of exceptional stress. In defensive battles of such magnitude as those which have just been fought to a successful conclusion the part played by subordinate commanders and staffs is frequently of decisive importance, demanding great strength of character and a high standard of ability, while the physical and mental strain is correspondingly great. That mistakes should occur in such circumstances is almost inevitable. That they should have been so few as they were and that control should at all times have been so well maintained reflects the greatest credit upon the individuals concerned, upon the staff arrangements of all formations, and the Army as a whole.

The part played by the various branches of the staff of an Army in the organisation and control of battles such as those referred to in this dispatch is one of the utmost importance, and the strain thrown upon the individual officers composing them is very great.

I wish to thank the heads of the various branches of the staff and of departments and services for the essential share that they and their subordinates have taken in preventing the realisation of the enemy's plans.

I am glad to acknowledge the great assistance given me at all times by my Chief of the General Staff, Lieut.-General the Hon. Sir H. A. Lawrence, K.C.B., whose cool judgment, equable temperament, and unfailing military insight were of the utmost value in circumstances demanding the exercise of such qualities in a peculiarly high degree.

The rapid incorporation of reinforcements and reorganisation of exhausted units, without which the battle could scarcely have been maintained, was most ably carried out by the Adjutant-General, Lieut.-General Sir G. H. Fowke, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., and his branch.

The work of my Quartermaster-General's Branch, under Lieut.-General Travers Clarke, C.B., in the provision and replacement of munitions and supplies of all kinds was of the highest importance, and was performed with the greatest ability and success.

The large and incessant demands made upon the Transportation Services in the course of the battle were met in the most admirable manner by my Director-General, Brigadier-General S. D'A. Crookshank, C.I.E., M.V.O., D.S.O., and those working under him.

My thanks are due also to the subordinate members of my Staff at General Headquarters, whose heavy and responsible duties were discharged throughout the period under review with most commendable smoothness and efficiency. In particular I desire to mention the services of my Artillery Adviser, Major-General Sir J. F. N. Birch, K.C.M.G., C.B.; my Engineer-in-Chief, Major-General G. M. Heath, C.B., D.S.O.; the Head of the Operations Section, Major-General J. H. Davidson, C.B., D.S.O.; the Head of the Staff Duties Section, Major-General G. P. Dawnay, C.M.G., D.S.O.; the Head of my Intelligence Section, Brigadier-General E. W. Cox, D.S.O.; and my Director of Army Signals, Major-General Sir J. S. Fowler, K.C.M.G., C.B., D.S.O.

My thanks, and those of all ranks of the British Armies in France, are due also to the different authorities at home, whose prompt and energetic action enabled the unavoidable losses of personnel and material incurred during the battle to be replaced with such rapidity. We are glad also to place on record once again our deep appreciation of the work of the Royal Navy, upon whose unceasing efforts depend the maintenance of the British Forces in France.

(71) I cannot close this report without paying my personal tribute to the ready and effective assistance given me by the French and Belgian Higher Command in the course of the Somme and Lys battles. Reference has already been made to the schemes for mutual co-operation and assistance between the French and British Armies which formed so important a part of the Allied plan for the year's campaign. These schemes have been carried out with absolute loyalty. The support rendered by French troops south of the Somme and north of the Lys, and by Belgian troops

in taking over the responsibility for the greater part of the line previously held by British troops north of Ypres, has been of incalculable value.

I desire also to express my appreciation of the services rendered by the Portuguese troops who had held a sector of my front continuously throughout the winter months, and on April 9 were called upon to withstand the assault of greatly superior forces.

Finally, I am glad to acknowledge the ready manner in which American Engineer Units have been placed at my disposal from time to time, and the great value of the assistance they have rendered. In the battles referred to in this dispatch American and British troops have fought shoulder to shoulder in the same trenches, and have shared together in the satisfaction of beating off German attacks. All ranks of the British Army look forward to the day when the rapidly growing strength of the American Army will allow American and British soldiers to co-operate in offensive action.

I have the honour to be, My Lord,
Your Lordship's obedient Servant,
D. HAIG,
Field-Marshal,
Commanding-in-Chief,
British Armies in France.

TERMS OF THE ARMISTICE CONCLUDED BETWEEN THE ALLIED POWERS AND THE OTTOMAN GOVERNMENT ON OCTOBER 30.

1. Opening of Dardanelles and Bosphorus and access to the Black Sea. Allied occupation of Dardanelles and Bosphorus forts.

2. Positions of all minefields, torpedo-tubes, and other obstructions in Turkish waters to be indicated, and assistance given to sweep or remove them as may be required.

3. All available information as to mines in the Black Sea to be communicated.

4. All Allied prisoners of war and Armenian interned persons and prisoners to be collected in Constantinople and handed over unconditionally to the Allies.

5. Immediate demobilisation of the Turkish Army, except for such troops as are required for the surveillance of the frontiers and for the maintenance of internal order. Number of effectives and their disposition to be determined later by the Allies after consultation with the Turkish Government.

6. Surrender of all war vessels in Turkish waters, or in waters occupied by Turkey. These ships to be interned at such Turkish port or ports as may be directed, except such small vessels as are required for police or similar purposes in Turkish territorial waters.

7. The Allies to have the right to occupy any strategic points in the event of any situation arising which threatens the security of the Allies.

8. Free use by Allied ships of all ports and anchorages now in Turkish occupation and denial of their use by enemy. Similar conditions to apply to Turkish mercantile shipping in Turkish waters for purposes of trade and demobilisation of the Army.

9. Use of all ship repair facilities at all Turkish ports and arsenals.
10. Allied occupation of the Taurus tunnel system.
11. Immediate withdrawal of Turkish troops from North-west Persia to behind the pre-war frontier has already been ordered, and will be carried out. Part of Transcaucasia has already been ordered to be evacuated by Turkish troops, the remainder to be evacuated if required by the Allies after they have studied the situation there.
12. Wireless telegraph and cable stations to be controlled by the Allies, Turkish Government messages excepted.
13. Prohibition to destroy any naval, military, or commercial material.
14. Facilities to be given for the purchase of coal, oil-fuel, and naval material from Turkish sources, after the requirements of the country have been met. None of the above material to be exported.
15. Allied Control Officers to be placed on all railways, including such portions of the Transcaucasian railways now under Turkish control, which must be placed at the free and complete disposal of the Allied authorities, due consideration being given to the needs of the population. This clause to include Allied occupation of Batum. Turkey will raise no objection to the occupation of Baku by the Allies.
16. The surrender of all garrisons in the Hedjaz, Asir, Yemen, Syria, and Mesopotamia to the nearest Allied Commander and the withdrawal of troops from Cilicia, except those necessary to maintain order, as will be determined under Clause 5.
17. The surrender of all Turkish officers in Tripolitania and Cyrenaica to the nearest Italian garrison. Turkey guarantees to stop supplies and communication with these officers if they do not obey the order to surrender.
18. The surrender of all ports occupied in Tripolitania and Cyrenaica, including Misurata, to the nearest Allied garrison.
19. All Germans and Austrians, naval, military, and civilian, to be evacuated within one month from Turkish dominions. Those in remote districts as soon after as may be possible.
20. Compliance with such orders as may be conveyed for the disposal of the equipment, arms, and ammunition, including transport of that portion of the Turkish Army which is demobilised under Clause 5.
21. An Allied representative to be attached to the Turkish Ministry of Supplies in order to safeguard Allied interests. This representative to be furnished with all necessary for this purpose.
22. Turkish prisoners to be kept at the disposal of the Allied Powers. The release of Turkish civilian prisoners and prisoners over military age to be considered.
23. Obligation on the part of Turkey to cease all relations with the Central Powers.
24. In case of disorder in the six Armenian vilayets the Allies reserve to themselves the right to occupy any part of them.
25. Hostilities between the Allies and Turkey shall cease from noon, local time, on Thursday, October 31, 1918.

TERMS OF THE ARMISTICE CONCLUDED BETWEEN THE ALLIED
POWERS AND THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN GOVERNMENT ON
NOVEMBER 3.

I. MILITARY CLAUSES.

1. The immediate cessation of hostilities by land, sea, and air.

2. Total demobilisation of the Austro-Hungarian Army, and immediate withdrawal of all Austro-Hungarian forces operating on the front from the North Sea to Switzerland.

Within Austro-Hungarian territory, limited as in Clause 3 below, there shall only be maintained as an organised military force a maximum of twenty Divisions, reduced to pre-war peace effectives.

Half the Divisional, Corps, and Army artillery and equipment shall be collected at points to be indicated by the Allies and United States of America for delivery to them, beginning with all such material as exists in the territories to be evacuated by the Austro-Hungarian forces.

3. Evacuation of all territories invaded by Austria-Hungary since the beginning of war. Withdrawal within such periods as shall be determined by the Commander-in-Chief of the Allied forces on each front of the Austro-Hungarian Armies behind a line fixed as follows :—

From Piz Umbrail to the north of the Stelvio it will follow the crest of the Rhaetian Alps up to the sources of the Adige and the Eisach, passing thence by Mounts Reschen and Brenner and the heights of Oetz and Ziller; the line thence turns south, crossing Mount Tolblach, and meeting the present frontier of the Carnic Alps. It follows this frontier up to Mount Tarvis, and after Mount Tarvis the watershed of the Julian Alps by the Col of Predil, Mount Mangart, the Tricorno (Terglou), and the watershed of the Cols di Podberdo, Podlaniscam, and Idria. From this point the line turns south-east towards the Schneeberg, excluding the whole basin of the Save and its tributaries; from the Schneeberg it goes down towards the coast in such a way as to include Castua, Mattuglia, and Volosca in the evacuated territories.

It will also follow the administrative limits of the present province of Dalmatia, including to the north Licarica and Trivania, and to the south territory limited by a line from the shore of Cape Planca to the summits of the watershed eastwards, so as to include in the evacuated area all the valleys and watercourses flowing towards Sebenico, such as the Cicola, Kerka, Butisnica, and their tributaries. It will also include all the islands in the north and west of Dalmatia, from Premuda, Selve, Ulbo, Scherda, Maon, Pago, and Puntadura in the north up to Meleda in the south, embracing Sant Andrea, Busi, Lissa, Lesina, Tercola, Curzola, Cazza, and Lagosta, as well as the neighbouring rocks and islets and Pelagosa, only excepting the islands of Great and Small Zirona, Bua, Solta, and Brazza.

All territories thus evacuated will be occupied by the troops of the Allies and of the United States of America.

All military and railway equipment of all kinds (including coal), belonging to or within these territories, to be left *in situ*, and surrendered to the Allies according to special orders given by the Commanders-in-Chief of the forces of the Associated Powers on the different fronts. No new

destruction, pillage, or requisition to be done by enemy troops in the territories to be evacuated by them and occupied by the forces of the Associated Powers.

4. The Allies shall have the right of free movement over all road and rail and waterways in Austro-Hungarian territory and of the use of the necessary Austrian and Hungarian means of transportation.

The Armies of the Associated Powers shall occupy such strategic points in Austria-Hungary at such times as they may deem necessary to enable them to conduct military operations or to maintain order.

They shall have the right of requisition on payment for the troops of the Associated Powers wherever they may be.

5. Complete evacuation of all German troops within fifteen days, not only from the Italian and Balkan fronts, but from all Austro-Hungarian territory.

Internment of all German troops which have not left Austria-Hungary within that date.

6. The administration of the evacuated territories of Austria-Hungary will be entrusted to the local authorities under the control of the Allied and Associated Armies of Occupation.

7. The immediate repatriation without reciprocity of all Allied prisoners of war and interned subjects, and of civil populations evacuated from their homes, on conditions to be laid down by the Commanders-in-Chief of the forces of the Associated Powers on the various fronts.

8. Sick and wounded who cannot be removed from evacuated territory will be cared for by Austro-Hungarian *personnel*, who will be left on the spot with the medical material required.

II. NAVAL CONDITIONS.

1. Immediate cessation of all hostilities at sea, and definite information to be given as to the location and movements of all Austro-Hungarian ships.

Notification to be made to neutrals that freedom of navigation in all territorial waters is given to the naval and mercantile marines of the Allied and Associated Powers, all questions of neutrality being waived.

2. Surrender to the Allies and the United States of America of fifteen Austro-Hungarian submarines, completed between the years 1910 and 1918, and of all German submarines which are in or may hereafter enter Austro-Hungarian territorial waters. All other Austro-Hungarian submarines to be paid off and completely disarmed, and to remain under the supervision of the Allies and the United States of America.

3. Surrender to the Allies and the United States of America, with their complete armament and equipment, of—

- 3 battleships,
- 3 light cruisers,
- 9 destroyers,
- 12 torpedo-boats,
- 1 minelayer,
- 6 Danube monitors,

to be designated by the Allies and the United States of America. All other surface warships (including river craft) are to be concentrated in

Austro-Hungarian naval bases to be designated by the Allies and the United States of America, and are to be paid off and completely disarmed and placed under the supervision of the Allies and the United States of America.

4. Freedom of navigation to all warships and merchant ships of the Allied and Associated Powers to be given in the Adriatic and up the River Danube and its tributaries in the territorial waters and territory of Austria-Hungary.

The Allies and Associated Powers shall have the right to sweep up all minefields and obstructions, and the positions of these are to be indicated.

In order to ensure the freedom of navigation on the Danube, the Allies and the United States of America shall be empowered to occupy or to dismantle all fortifications or defence works.

5. The existing blockade conditions set up by the Allied and Associated Powers are to remain unchanged, and all Austro-Hungarian merchant ships found at sea are to remain liable to capture, save exceptions which may be made by a Commission nominated by the Allies and the United States of America.

6. All naval aircraft are to be concentrated and immobilised in Austro-Hungarian bases to be designated by the Allies and the United States of America.

7. Evacuation of all the Italian coasts and of all ports occupied by Austria-Hungary outside their national territory, and the abandonment of all floating craft, naval materials, equipment, and materials for inland navigation of all kinds.

8. Occupation by the Allies and the United States of America of the land and sea fortifications and the islands which form the defences and of the dockyards and arsenal at Pola.

9. All merchant vessels held by Austria-Hungary belonging to the Allies and Associated Powers to be returned.

10. No destruction of ships or of materials to be permitted before evacuation, surrender, or restoration.

11. All naval and mercantile marine prisoners of war of the Allied and Associated Powers in Austro-Hungarian hands to be returned without reciprocity.

TERMS OF THE ARMISTICE CONCLUDED BETWEEN THE ALLIED POWERS AND THE GERMAN GOVERNMENT, SIGNED NOVEMBER 11.

A. CLAUSES RELATING TO WESTERN FRONT.

I.—Cessation of operations by land and in the air six hours after the signature of the Armistice.

II.—Immediate evacuation of invaded countries—Belgium, France, Alsace-Lorraine, Luxemburg—so ordered as to be completed within fourteen days from the signature of the Armistice.

German troops which have not left the above-mentioned territories within the period fixed will become prisoners of war.

Occupation by the Allied and United States Forces jointly will keep pace with evacuation in these areas.

All movements of evacuation and occupation will be regulated in accordance with a Note.

III.—Repatriation, beginning at once, to be completed within fourteen days, of all inhabitants of the countries above enumerated (including hostages, persons under trial, or convicted).

IV.—Surrender in good condition by the German Armies of the following equipment:—

5,000 guns (2,500 heavy, 2,500 field).

30,000 machine-guns.

3,000 *Minenwerfer*.

2,000 aeroplanes (fighters, bombers—firstly D.7's—and night-bombing machines).

The above to be delivered *in situ* to the Allied and United States troops in accordance with the detailed conditions laid down in the Note.

V.—Evacuation by the German Armies of the countries on the left bank of the Rhine. These countries on the left bank of the Rhine shall be administered by the local authorities under the control of the Allied and United States Armies of occupation.

The occupation of these territories will be carried out by Allied and United States garrisons holding the principal crossings of the Rhine (Mayence, Coblenz, Cologne), together with bridgeheads at these points of a 30 kilometre [about 19 miles] radius on the right bank, and by garrisons similarly holding the strategic points of the regions.

A neutral zone shall be set up on the right bank of the Rhine between the river and a line drawn 10 kilometres [$6\frac{1}{2}$ miles] distant, starting from the Dutch frontier to the Swiss frontier. In the case of inhabitants, no person shall be prosecuted for having taken part in any military measures previous to the signing of the Armistice.

No measure of a general or official character shall be taken which would have, as a consequence, the depreciation of industrial establishments or a reduction of their *personnel*.

Evacuation by the enemy of the Rhinelands shall be so ordered as to be completed within a further period of sixteen days, in all thirty-one days after the signature of the Armistice.

All movements of evacuation and occupation will be regulated according to the Note.

VI.—In all territory evacuated by the enemy there shall be no evacuation of inhabitants; no damage or harm shall be done to the persons or property of the inhabitants.

No destruction of any kind to be committed.

Military establishments of all kinds shall be delivered intact, as well as military stores of food, munitions, equipment not removed during the periods fixed for evacuation.

Stores of food of all kinds for the civil population, cattle, etc., shall be left *in situ*.

Industrial establishments shall not be impaired in any way, and their *personnel* shall not be moved.

VII.—Roads and means of communication of every kind, railroads, waterways, main roads, bridges, telegraphs, telephones shall be in no manner impaired.

All civil and military *personnel* at present employed on them shall remain.

5,000 locomotives, 150,000 wagons, and 5,000 motor lorries in good working order, with all necessary spare parts and fittings, shall be delivered to the Associated Powers within the period fixed for the evacuation of Belgium and Luxemburg.

The railways of Alsace-Lorraine shall be handed over within the same period, together with all pre-war *personnel* and material.

Further, material necessary for the working of railways in the country on the left bank of the Rhine shall be left *in situ*.

All stores of coal and material for upkeep of permanent way, signals, and repair shops shall be left *in situ* and kept in an efficient state by Germany, as far as the means of communication are concerned, during the whole period of the Armistice.

All barges taken from the Allies shall be restored to them. The Note appended regulates the detail of these measures.

VIII.—The German Command shall be responsible for revealing all mines or delay-action fuses disposed on territory evacuated by the German troops and shall assist in their discovery and destruction.

The German Command shall also reveal all destructive measures that may have been taken (such as poisoning or pollution of springs, wells, etc.), under penalty of reprisals.

IX.—The right of requisition shall be exercised by the Allied and United States Armies in all occupied territory, save for settlement of accounts with authorised persons.

The upkeep of the troops of occupation in the Rhineland (excluding Alsace-Lorraine) shall be charged to the German Government.

X.—The immediate repatriation, without reciprocity, according to detailed conditions which shall be fixed, of all Allied and United States prisoners of war; the Allied Powers and the United States of America shall be able to dispose of these prisoners as they wish. However, the return of German prisoners of war interned in Holland and Switzerland shall continue as heretofore. The return of German prisoners of war shall be settled at peace preliminaries.

XI.—Sick and wounded who cannot be removed from evacuated territory will be cared for by German *personnel*, who will be left on the spot, with the medical material required.

B. CLAUSES RELATING TO THE EASTERN FRONTIERS OF GERMANY.

XII.—All German troops at present in any territory which before the war belonged to Russia, Rumania, or Turkey shall withdraw within the frontiers of Germany as they existed on August 1, 1914, and all German troops at present in territories which before the war formed part of Russia must likewise return to within the frontiers of Germany as above defined as soon as the Allies shall think the moment suitable, having regard to the internal situation of these territories.

XIII.—Evacuation by German troops to begin at once; and all German

German bases to be specified by the Allies and the United States of America.

XXVIII.—In evacuating the Belgian coasts and forts Germany shall abandon all merchant ships, tugs, lighters, cranes, and all other harbour materials, all materials for inland navigation, all aircraft and air materials and stores, all arms and armaments, and all stores and apparatus of all kinds.

XXIX.—All Black Sea ports are to be evacuated by Germany; all Russian warships of all descriptions seized by Germany in the Black Sea are to be handed over to the Allies and the United States of America; all neutral merchant ships seized are to be released; all warlike and other materials of all kinds seized in those ports are to be returned, and German materials as specified in Clause XXVIII. are to be abandoned.

XXX.—All merchant ships in German hands belonging to the Allied and Associated Powers are to be restored in ports to be specified by the Allies and the United States of America without reciprocity.

XXXI.—No destruction of ships or materials to be permitted before evacuation, surrender, or restoration.

XXXII.—The German Government shall formally notify the neutral Governments of the world, and particularly the Governments of Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland, that all restrictions placed on the trading of their vessels with the Allied and Associated countries, whether by the German Government or by private German interests, and whether in return for specific concessions, such as the export of shipbuilding materials or not, are immediately cancelled.

XXXIII.—No transfers of German merchant shipping of any description to any neutral flag are to take place after signature of the Armistice.

F. DURATION OF ARMISTICE.

XXXIV.—The duration of the Armistice is to be 36 days, with option to extend. During this period, on failure of execution of any of the above clauses, the Armistice may be denounced by one of the contracting parties on 48 hours' previous notice.

G. TIME LIMIT FOR REPLY.

XXXV.—This Armistice to be accepted or refused by Germany within 72 hours of notification.

OBITUARY

OF

EMINENT PERSONS DECEASED IN 1918.

JANUARY.

2. **Francis Welles Newmarch, C.S.I.**, late Financial Secretary of the India Office, who was 65 years of age, was the son of the Rev. C. S. Newmarch, Rector of Leverton, Lincolnshire. He matriculated at Balliol College, Oxford, and was a Scholar of Corpus Christi College from 1873-78, when he took a Double First. He then entered the Military Department of the India Office where he remained until 1902, when he became Assistant Secretary in the Financial Department, being made Secretary in 1911.

— **The Rev. Canon Morris**, Vicar of St. Gabriel's, Warwick Square, London, Prebendary of Matlery in St. Paul's Cathedral, was born in 1844. In 1869 he became Classical Master at Rossall, and later was Principal of the Training College for South Wales and Monmouthshire, and then successively Curate of St. Mary's, Park Street, Head Master of the Godolphin School, Hammersmith, and Chaplain and Librarian to the Duke of Westminster, who appointed him to St. Gabriel's in 1894. He was a keen Archæologist and Antiquarian.

— **Charles Chancellor**, Architect and Surveyor, born 1825, was a founder of the Essex Archæological Society. In 1859 he was made first Mayor of Chelmsford, an office which he held seven times.

4. **Captain F. H. B. Selous, M.C.**, Royal West Surrey Regiment, was 19 years of age. He was the eldest son of the late Captain F. C. Selous, D.S.O., the famous African explorer and hunter, and he was killed in action. He was educated at Rugby where he was in the Running VIII.

and was captain of the Rugby XV. in 1915. He entered Sandhurst in 1915, and went to the front in 1916, and was the recipient of the Military Cross and the Italian Silver Medal of Military Valour.

6. **Mrs. Clement Shorter** was better known as **Dora Sigerson**, the Irish poetess, to whose poems George Meredith wrote an introduction. She was a native of Dublin, and her works deal largely with Irish folk-lore. Her poems are more remarkable for beauty of ideas than for literary craft.

8. **Major-General George Rennie Manderson, C.B.**, Royal Bengal Artillery, was in his 84th year. He entered the Army in 1851 and served with distinction in Burma, in the Mutiny, in the Jowaki Campaign, and also in the Afghan War, 1878-79, for which he received the C.B.

11. **Mrs. Mary Emma Kitchener**, who died at Dinan, France, aged 84, was the widow of Lieut.-Colonel H. H. Kitchener, and step-mother of the late Field-Marshal Earl Kitchener. She was married in 1866, and had one daughter.

13. **Professor Herbert Augustus Strong**, born in 1841, was the son of the Rev. Edmond Strong, Rector of Clyst St. Mary, Exeter. For many years Professor, and since 1909 Emeritus Professor of Latin in the University of Liverpool, he was educated at Winchester and Oxford. He was successively Assistant Professor of Humanity at Glasgow, Professor (1872) of Classics in Melbourne University, whence he passed to Liverpool. He published editions and translations of the Classics.

13. **Charlotte Mary, Countess of Carysfort**, aged 80, was the widow of the fifth Earl, at whose death in 1909 the title became extinct.

14. **Dr. Henry Montagu Butler**, the famous Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, who died at Cambridge in his 85th year, was for many years one of the most distinguished figures in the academic life of England. His father, who had been Senior Wrangler in 1794, was Head Master of Harrow from 1805 to 1829, and also Rector of Gayton, where his son Henry was born. Educated at Harrow, he proceeded in 1852 to Trinity College, Cambridge, where in the course of three years he held two Scholarships, won the Greek ode prize on two occasions, the Camden medal, the Porson prize for Greek Iambics and the Latin essay prize, and ended in 1855 as Senior Classic, immediately after which he was elected to a Fellowship. At the early age of 26, and while still a layman, Dr. Butler was chosen Head Master of Harrow, where he succeeded his intimate friend Dr. Vaughan, and in the course of the same year was ordained, first deacon and then priest. During the twenty-six years of his Head Mastership 130,000*l.* was raised towards the school funds by the voluntary efforts of Harrovians and their friends, and when in 1885 he accepted the Deanery of Gloucester the great increase in the numbers at the school and its established position testified to his ability. Dr. Butler only remained at Gloucester for a year, as on the death of Thompson, Master of Trinity, he was appointed by the Crown as his successor. In religious, as in political controversy, he was the most suave of opponents, and probably few men's utterances ever helped more towards smoothness in discussion. Among Dr. Butler's many notable friends were Tennyson and Browning, and as a young man he was known as a keen mountaineer. He published in 1914 his book "Some Leisure Hours of a Long Life," which illustrated his powers as a writer of classical verse, and his work "Sermons Historical and Biographical" is noteworthy as being very characteristic of the writer. Among the honours received during his long life it may be mentioned that he was appointed *Commendatore della Corona d'Italia*, in 1871, was Chaplain to Queen Victoria from 1875 to 1883, Examining Chaplain to Archbishops Tait and Benson from 1879 to 1883, and a Prebendary of St. Paul's. Also in 1898 he was made an honorary Canon of Ely

and in 1901 a Governor of Harrow. Dr. Butler was married twice; first, to Georgina, grand-daughter of the Right Hon. Hugh Elliot, British Minister to the Court of Frederick the Great, and secondly, to Agnata Frances, daughter of Sir James Ramsay of Banff. He left issue by both marriages.

14. **Dr. Charles O'Neill, M.P.** for South Armagh, who died at his residence in Coatbridge, Lanarkshire, was born in 1849. He was educated at Glasgow University. He practised in Coatbridge of which place he was a Town Councillor and at one time Senior Magistrate. He was also a Justice of the Peace for Lanarkshire. Returned as the Nationalist Member for South Armagh in 1909, he was associated with Mr. Isaac Butt at the beginning of the movement for Home Rule.

15. **Brigadier-General Arthur Anthony Howell, C.M.G., T.D.**, was in command of a London Reserve Brigade, and died suddenly at the age of 56. He served with distinction both in the South African and in the Great European Wars, being appointed C.M.G. in 1915. He was the son of the Dean of St. David's, and married in 1895 Charlotte Isabel, daughter of the late John Firth of Sheffield.

17. **Colonel George Fletcher Ottley Boughiey, C.S.I.**, late Royal Engineers, was 74 years of age. He received his commission in 1862, went to India in 1865, and served with distinction in the Bhutan expedition. From 1869 until he retired, about thirty years later, he was in the Railway Branch of the Public Works Department, except for two years' active service in the Afghan War. As executive engineer, consulting engineer, and manager respectively of five great Indian railways he was strongly in favour of State ownership.

20. **General Sir Beauchamp Duff, G.C.B., G.C.S.I.**, was in his 68th year, and was the son of Garden William Duff of Hatton Castle, Aberdeenshire. Educated at Trinity College, Glenalmond, and at Woolwich, he received his commission in the Royal Artillery in 1874, and from 1877 to 1879 served in the second Afghan War. In 1881 he transferred to the Indian Army and was appointed to the 9th Bengal Infantry; he obtained his Captaincy in 1886. In 1888-89 he passed first on the list through the Staff College, and from 1891 to 1895 he was Deputy-Assistant Adjutant-General at

the Indian Army Headquarters at Simla and Calcutta. He obtained his majority in 1894, and on the Afghan frontier was D.A.A.G. of the escort of the Boundary Delimitation Commission. In the punitive expedition which followed the famous night attack against the camp of the Commission at Wana in Waziristan, Duff distinguished himself, and in 1895 he was made a Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel. About this time he became Military Secretary to the Commander-in-Chief in India, Sir George White, and in 1899 he came home, having been appointed Assistant Military Secretary for Indian Affairs at the War Office. On the outbreak of the South African War later in the same year he became Military Secretary to Sir George White, and went through the siege of Ladysmith; later in the war he acted as Assistant Adjutant-General on Lord Roberts' Staff. In 1901 Duff went back to India where, after he had spent eighteen months as Deputy Adjutant-General at Army Headquarters, he was given command of the Allahabad Brigade. He became a Major-General in 1903, and in the same year Adjutant-General of the Army of India. Lord Kitchener, then Commander-in-Chief in India, relied greatly upon Duff's help in his schemes for the reorganisation of the Army, and on him fell much of the documentary work in the controversy with the Viceroy, Lord Curzon, about the abolition of the Military Department. Duff was made Chief of the Staff by Lord Kitchener in 1906, and a K.C.V.O. on the same day. He was the organiser of the new General Staff in India, and among other important measures was instrumental in establishing the Quetta Staff College. Duff came home in 1909 to succeed Sir O'Moore Creagh (who had been made Commander-in-Chief in India) as Secretary to the Military Department at the India Office. In 1913 he was made Commander-in-Chief in India, and in April, 1914, he took up the post, and a few months later was confronted with the momentous decisions required by the European War. The military organisation in India had many unexpected calls made upon it, and under Duff's supervision many of them were admirably carried out; but the Home Government considered that the Mesopotamian Expedition was inadequately provided for, and the Commission which sat in 1917 to inquire into the causes of its failure passed a "severe censure" on Duff, and placed him third in order of responsibility for the advance on Baghdad which ended

in the Kut disaster. Duff came home before the Commission sat, and after its report his return to India was not possible. But it must not be forgotten that Lord Kitchener considered him a very able man, and when he retired from India he spoke of Duff as his "right-hand man."

22. Sir John Wolfe Barry, K.C.B., the eminent civil engineer, was born in 1836, and was the youngest son of the late Sir Charles Barry, the architect of the Houses of Parliament. He was educated at Trinity College, Glenalmond, and at King's College, London, and becoming a pupil of Sir John Hawkshaw he was associated with him in the construction of Charing Cross and Cannon Street Stations, and the bridges in connexion with them. In 1867 he started in practice for himself, and speedily gained a reputation, especially by his railway work. He became consulting engineer to several important railways in England, in India, and in China, and was the engineer of the Barry Docks and Railways among many others, and also of the Tower Bridge. In 1898 and 1899 Sir John was Chairman of the Council of the Society of Arts, and he strongly advocated the necessity of improving the narrow streets of London which caused great congestion of traffic and consequent financial loss. He was a member of the Royal Commission on London Traffic which sat in 1903-5, and was also one of the advisory board of engineers which gave the Commission expert counsel. In 1901 the British Engineering Standards Committee was established as a result of his efforts. This grew into a great organisation for the standardisation of rolled sections, and may be said to have reconciled conflicting interests in the railway world and to have saved British industry annually several millions sterling. Sir John, who was President of the Institute of Civil Engineers in 1896, was largely responsible for the establishment of that body of an entrance examination to its ranks, and he was Chairman of the Examination Committee for twenty years. Sir John was Chairman of Westminster Hospital, in which he was greatly interested, and sat on numerous Royal Commissions. He was made a K.C.B. in 1897.

— **Sir James Alexander Russell** was Lord Provost of Edinburgh and Admiral of the Firth of Forth from 1891 to 1894. He was greatly interested in questions of public health, and was a

member of the Edinburgh Town Council for twenty years.

23. Sir Alexander Meadows Rendel, K.C.I.E., who was in his 89th year, was the eldest and only surviving son of the late Mr. James Meadows Rendel, F.R.S., an eminent engineer and President of the Institute of Civil Engineers. Three of the four sons, Lord Rendel, George Rendel, and Hamilton Rendel became partners of Sir William Armstrong of Elswick. Sir Alexander, who was a scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, began his career as assistant to his father, and on the death of the latter in 1856 he took over and extended their practice. He designed the Royal Albert Docks, the Shadwell Basin on the Thames, and the Albert and Edinburgh Docks at Leith. But his greatest work was accomplished in connexion with Indian Railways. He paid many visits to that country, the first being in 1857, the year of the mutiny, when there were scarcely any railways in existence there. He designed a great number of bridges in India, more than sixty of which crossed rivers with waterways varying in width from 1,000 to 10,000 feet. The Lansdowne Bridge over the Indus at Sukkur, opened in 1889, and the Hardinge Bridge over the Ganges at Sara, opened in 1915, were two of the most important. Sir Alexander, as adviser to the India Office in this country and to most of the important railways in India, took a prominent part in deciding weighty questions concerning engineering, and also administrative and economic matters which affected the development of engineering in India.

— **Dr. Henry Maudsley** was in his 88rd year, and was well known as an exponent of what has been described as medical materialism. He was born in Yorkshire, and was educated at Giggleswick School, and at University College Hospital, and he took his degree of M.D. Lond. in 1857. He held various important appointments in connexion with his work as a specialist in mental disease, edited from 1862 to 1878 the *Journal of Mental Science*, and published a number of works on the same subject, which were ably written but pessimistic in tone. The last of these, "Organic to Human," set forth the final conclusions to which his studies as a physician and philosopher had brought him, and was published only two years before his death. In 1908 Dr. Maudsley gave 30,000*l.* to the London County Council

Asylums Committee for the treatment of the mentally disordered.

24. General Sir Stanley De Burgh Edwardes, K.C.B., was born in 1840, entered the Bombay Army in 1857, and served in the Mutiny, in Abyssinia, and in the Afghan campaign of 1879-80. He also commanded the Northern Division of the Bombay Army in 1887-89.

— **Sir Samuel Augustus Petherbridge, K.C.M.G.**, was born in 1862 at Brisbane, and was a remarkably able and well-known Australian Civil servant. At one time a Commander in the Royal Australian Naval Reserve he became Secretary to the Commonwealth Department of Finance in 1910. He joined the Australian Forces on the outbreak of war, and was administrator first of the North-West Pacific Islands (taken from the enemy by the Australians), and secondly, in 1915, of German New Guinea.

25. Sir William Wedderburn, Bart., was in his 80th year. He was the head of an ancient Scottish family, and numbered well-known Jacobites among his ancestors. Sir William was born in Edinburgh, and was educated at Hofwyl, Worksop, Loretto, and Edinburgh University, and entered the Indian Civil Service in 1859. He was acting Judicial Commissioner in Sind from 1874 to 1876; for nearly two years he was acting Judge of the Bombay High Court, and when he retired, in 1887, he was acting as Chief Secretary to the Local Government. In 1889 he founded the British Committee of the Indian National Congress and was still its chairman at his death. He entered Parliament as Member for Banffshire in 1893, and soon formed an Indian Parliamentary Committee. Both during his seven years in Parliament and after his retirement Sir William's main interest in life was centred in Indian affairs. He returned twice to that country to preside at sessions of the National Congress. He kept open house for Indians at his country home in Gloucestershire, and he gave liberal financial help to the support of their political cause. He married, in 1879, Mary Blanche, daughter of Mr. H. W. Hoskyns, by whom he had two daughters.

27. The Rev. Dr. William Greenwell, D.C.L., F.R.S., the distinguished antiquarian, was in his 98th year. He was educated at Durham and was ordained in 1844. He held

successively the benefices of Ovingham and Mickley, Northumberland, and St. Mary the Less, Durham, and was also at one time Principal of Neville Hall, Newcastle-on-Tyne, and a Fellow of Durham University, and was for over half a century a Minor Canon of Durham Cathedral. Dr. Greenwell was a well-known writer on antiquarian and archaeological subjects, and he was a generous benefactor to the British Museum, his gifts to which included collections of antiquities excavated by him from British barrows and a collection of flint implements of the Stone Age found in Norfolk. Dr. Greenwell's contributions to antiquarian literature were numerous, and extended over a long period. They dealt largely with places and monuments of historical interest in the northern counties, but his greatest book published in 1877 was "British Barrows," which treated of

about 280 burial mounds belonging to a period before the Roman occupation of Britain. Dr. Greenwell was for many years librarian of Durham Cathedral, was a member of the Society of Antiquaries from 1868, and a Fellow of the Royal Society from 1878. He was a keen angler, and enjoyed the sport long after he had passed his ninetieth birthday. His knowledge of North country family histories was remarkable, and he could discourse fluently on this subject almost up to the day of his death.

27. **Albert H. Hodge, R.B.S.**, who was 42 years of age, was selected three years before his death as the sculptor of the Captain Scott Memorial. He left the designs and models for this work in such an advanced state that their completion should present no difficulties.

FEBRUARY.

1. **The Dowager Countess of Mayo, V.A., C.I.**, was the widow of the sixth Earl, and was in her 92nd year. She was the fourth daughter of the first Baron Leconfield, and was married in 1848. Her husband was Chief Secretary for Ireland in 1852, 1858, and 1866, and Viceroy of India from 1868 to 1872, when he was assassinated in the Andaman Islands. From 1874 to 1901 Lady Mayo was Extra Lady of the Bedchamber to Queen Victoria.

2. **John Lawrence Sullivan**, the famous prize fighter, was born in 1858, in Boston, U.S.A., and first made his reputation near his home. He afterwards met the champion of America whom he defeated, and in 1888 the English champion, Charles Mitchell. This fight ended in a draw after thirty-nine rounds. Sullivan held the title of champion for ten years, from 1882 to 1892, when he met and was defeated by James J. Corbett, known as "Pompadour Jem."

— **Clement Arthur Miles**, who was only 37 years of age, had been for a long time a member of Mr. T. Fisher Unwin's literary staff. His wide knowledge of European languages contributed largely to the value of his book, "Christmas: In Ritual and Tradition," and he was responsible for translations into English of various works, including Sabatier's "Modernism."

3. **The Rev. Canon William John Knox-Little**, who died at Worcester after a long illness, was born in 1839 in Ireland. He took his degree at Cambridge in 1862, and was ordained to the curacy of Christ Church, Lancaster, in 1863. From 1865 to 1870 he was an Assistant Master at Sherborne School, and from 1870 to 1874 was a curate at Turweston, near Brackley. He then came to London for a year, and, as curate of St. Thomas', Regent Street, his eloquence in the pulpit began to attract attention. In 1875 he was presented by the Dean of Manchester to the benefice of St. Alban's, Cheetwood, in that diocese. In 1881 Mr. Gladstone appointed Knox-Little to a Canonry in Worcester Cathedral, and in 1885 he resigned his living at Cheetwood and was made rector of Hoar Cross, Staffordshire. Canon Knox-Little went to South Africa during the Boer War as chaplain to the Brigade of Guards, and published a book of his impressions on his return. He resigned the vicarage of Hoar Cross in 1907, but retained his Canonry of Worcester until his death. Canon Knox-Little was a popular rather than a great preacher. He was a frequent speaker at meetings of the great Church societies representing his school of thought, and he also published some devotional works, and a few entirely charming books of fiction.

6. **The Marquess of Dufferin and Ava** was born in 1866 and succeeded to the title in 1902. He was the second

son of the first Marquess (his elder brother was killed in the South African War), and he entered the Diplomatic Service in 1890. Six years later he exchanged into the Foreign Office and remained there until his death. He married the daughter of Mr. John H. Davis of New York, by whom he had three daughters. The title therefore passed to his younger brother, Lord Frederick Blackwood.

6. **Viscount Guillamore** was born in 1841, educated at Addiscombe, and served in the Madras Royal Artillery. He was also in civil employment in India during 1879-80. He was a Deputy-Lieutenant for Limerick, and was unmarried. The title passed to his brother, the Hon. Frederick Standish O'Grady.

7. **M. Louis Renault**, who was 73 years of age, was a great authority on international law, on which subject he published several works. He was one of the delegates of the French Government to the Hague Congress, and a member of the permanent Court of Arbitration. He was also a member of the Institute, Minister Plenipotentiary, Professor of the Faculty of Law in Paris, Jurisconsult of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and a Commander of the Legion of Honour.

9. **Mrs. Eleanor Mary Sellar** was the widow of Professor W. Y. Sellar of the Chair of Humanity in Edinburgh University. She was born at Havre in 1829, and was the eldest daughter of Alexander Dennistoun, a member of a great Glasgow merchant house. Mrs. Sellar was married in 1852, her husband (a Fellow of Oriel, and one of a remarkable group of Oxford men) being at that time Deputy-Professor of Latin in Glasgow University. Mrs. Sellar had a wonderful faculty for making friends, and among these were Robert Louis Stevenson, John Brown (the author of "Rab and his Friends"), Herbert Spencer, the Tennyson family, and Dr. Jowett. Mrs. Sellar published in 1907 her book, "Recollections and Impressions," dedicated to her children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren.

10. **Abdul Hamid II.**, the ex-Sultan of Turkey, was the second son of Sultan Abdul Medjid, and was born in 1842. When he ascended the Throne in 1876 he had two problems to face. His Empire was in danger from within owing to the revolutionary forces pro-

voked by the weakness and misgovernment of his predecessors, and abroad he had to cope with the rival ambitions of the great Powers and to endeavour to turn them to his own purposes. He began by appointing a reforming Grand Vizier and proclaiming a Constitution; but this was only a bid for popularity, and the Grand Vizier was imprisoned two months later, and subsequently strangled by the Sultan's orders. Just before the outbreak of the war with Russia in 1877 the Sultan promised reforms to the deputies who had been elected to Parliament under the Constitution, and when, at the end of the war, British intervention saved Turkey from even greater humiliations at the hands of Russia than those which fell to her lot, Abdul Hamid, as the price of such aid, again promised internal reforms. These he made no attempt to carry out, but instead set the Mussulman populations of his country against the Christian. For years the Armenian massacres were a blot on Turkey and a scandal to Europe, and the final outbreak of ferocity in 1896, when 5,000 of these Christians were murdered in Constantinople in the space of thirty-six hours, gained for the Sultan the title of "The Great Assassin." In Egyptian affairs the Sultan played his customary rôle. In 1882 he encouraged Arabi in order that Turkey might intervene in Egypt. But after he had failed to send troops to support the British, and constantly postponed the ratification of a convention which arranged terms on which Britain would withdraw her forces from that country, the British Government grew tired of his methods and recalled their deputation in 1889. The Sultan then turned his attention to Germany. He wanted support against Russia, and this Britain would only give provided those Turkish internal reforms were carried out which Abdul Hamid was secretly resolved to oppose. Wilhelm II., on the other hand, flattered his vanity and won from him the coveted railway concessions, which were important items in Germany's schemes for Eastern expansion. As time went on the Sultan's autocratic powers grew more and more pronounced and unpopular, until, in 1905, at Salonika, a Committee was formed which set to work to organise a revolutionary party, composed in the first place of officers and men of the 3rd Army Corps. The organisation soon had supporters, civil as well as military, all over the Empire, and in June, 1908, the revolt broke out in Macedonia. The Committee threatened that unless Abdul Hamid

would at once restore the Constitution their troops would march on Constantinople, and they were daily increasing in power. The Sultan was forced to yield, and for a time appeared with great success as a Constitutional Monarch. In April, 1909, however, a counter-revolution broke out in Constantinople, and though this was speedily crushed, and there was no evidence to prove Abdul Hamid's complicity in it, nevertheless it was felt that his deposition was necessary. Accordingly his brother was chosen to succeed him on the Throne, and he was sent as a State prisoner to Salonika. When the Greeks arrived at Salonika during the Balkan War he was brought back to the Capital, but in 1915 it was judged prudent to remove him to Magnesia, 30 miles from Smyrna. Abdul Hamid in private life was an abstemious and sober man, fond of exercise, and an untiring worker, entering into minute details of official business. The only break in this routine was when the news came to him of a plot or conspiracy. Then every affair of State was neglected while the Sultan devoted all his energies to unravelling the skeins of the design against him. Though he does not appear to have loved cruelty for its own sake, yet he pursued his enemies relentlessly, sometimes for years, until his revengeful spirit tracked them down; and its blow would fall upon them as from an unseen and merciless Fate.

10. The Rev. Thomas Scott Holmes, D.D., Canon and Chancellor of Wells Cathedral, was born in 1852. He was educated at Liverpool and Cambridge, where he was a foundation scholar of Sidney Sussex College. He took his B.A. degree as a senior optime in 1875 and became a tutor at St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead. In 1877 he was made Vice-Principal of Wells Theological College, and in 1879 Vicar of Wookey, Somerset, where he remained until in 1900 he became a Canon Residentiary of Wells, the Chancellorship following in 1904. Dr. Holmes took his D.D. degree in 1910 and was for ten years a Proctor in Convocation. He was an authority on ecclesiastical history, and in 1906-8 was Birkbeck Lecturer in this subject at Trinity College, Cambridge. He published many works dealing with the same theme, chiefly concerned with the antiquities of the Diocese of Wells. He was a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society, and married, in 1880, Miss Katharine Freeman.

11. Taitou, Dowager Empress of Abyssinia, was 65 years of age and was the daughter of the King of Gondar. In 1883 she married, as her fifth husband, Menelik, then King of Shoa. A woman famous for her beauty, and possessed of remarkable force of character, she supported her husband in the various civil wars which culminated in his being raised to the position of Emperor in 1889. At the battle of Adowa, she sent her own hereditary troops into the field, and the Italian enemy met with a great defeat. After 1889 the Empress resided almost entirely at Abis Ababa, and rarely received Europeans. When she did so, she was gracious and apparently interested in public affairs. She really governed the country during Menelik's long illness, and it was largely owing to her that his successor, the young Lijj Jeassu, a feeble ruler, was deposed in favour of his aunt Zeodita, Menelik's elder daughter. The Empress Taitou bore Menelik no children.

— **Lieut.-Colonel Neville Bowes Elliot-Cooper, V.C., D.S.O., M.C.,** who died of wounds while a prisoner of war in Hanover, was 29 years of age. He was awarded the V.C. only a month before his death for his gallantry in defending his post against a surprise attack by a superior force of the enemy. He ordered his own men to retire when it was necessary for their safety, although he himself was left unarmed and wounded in the hands of the Germans.

12. Admiral Arthur Archibald Campbell Galloway, who was in his 63rd year, entered the Navy as a cadet in 1869. He served as gunnery lieutenant at the bombardment of Alexandria, during the Egyptian War in 1882, and received the medal and the Khedive's Bronze Star. He was in command of the *Daphne* when in 1898 she was one of the two ships which entered Port Arthur, and, defying the injunctions of the Russians and under their guns, he remained there ready for action, until the British Government ordered him to leave. In 1906, when Captain of the Gunnery School at Sheerness, in which post he had greatly distinguished himself, he was suddenly transferred to Portsmouth, where a mutiny had broken out among the stokers in the Naval Barracks. Order and content were quickly restored and Galloway remained Commodore until 1908. He was promoted Admiral in 1916.

18. Sir Reuben Vincent Barrow, J.P., was in his 80th year. He was Liberal Member of Parliament for Bermondsey from 1872 to 1895 and introduced the Equalisation of Rates Bill which he saw carried into law. He was Chairman of the Croydon County Bench for twenty-one years, and a prominent Baptist. He was Mayor of Croydon in 1885.

14. Sir Cecil Spring Rice, who died suddenly at Ottawa in his 59th year, was the British Ambassador to the United States, and was returning home on leave. Educated at Eton and Balliol College, Oxford, he was a scholar and man of the world, with a deep interest in world politics. He was Assistant Private Secretary to Lord Granville in 1884, and in 1885 Précis Writer to Lord Rosebery. In 1886 he first went to Washington as Acting Third Secretary, was transferred to Tokyo in 1891 for a short time, and later he returned to Washington for two years and then proceeded to Berlin in 1895. As Secretary of Legation he spent nearly three years at Teheran, and from there went to Cairo where he was seconded for the post of British Commissioner for the Egyptian Debt. He went to St. Petersburg in 1908 as Secretary, and afterwards became Councillor of Embassy, remaining in Russia during the war with Japan, and the revolutionary movement which followed it. As Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary he then went to Persia, being transferred in 1908 to Stockholm, where he remained in the same capacity until he was appointed Ambassador to the United States in 1913. During his period of service in Berlin Sir Cecil had gauged the trend of mind of the Kaiser and the German forces which made for war, and the events of 1914 were no surprise to him. He was home on leave when war broke out, and quickly returned to Washington, firmly persuaded both of the severity of the struggle which had begun, and of the vital importance of the attitude of the United States towards it. Although he knew that the sympathies of the American people were mainly with the Allies, he was also aware that only gross provocation from Germany would cause the United States to go to war, and through all the difficult period of American neutrality it can justly be said that no mistakes in diplomacy could be attributed to him. Sir Cecil was coming home for a period of rest while Lord Reading acted as Special Ambassador in Washington. A man of great natural gifts and wide

sympathies, Sir Cecil had a host of firm friends, and was a high-minded and devoted patriot. He was married in 1904 to the daughter of Sir Frank Lascelles, his old chief in Berlin, and he left a son and a daughter.

16. John Barton Bumpus, who was 65, had been a bookman for nearly fifty years. He was one of the directors of the firm of J. & E. Bumpus of Oxford Street, which was founded by his great-grandfather. He entered his father's business at the age of 17.

19. John Claude White, C.I.E., who was 64, did much to improve the relations between the British Government and the North-Eastern Himalayan States of Sikkim and Bhutan. He was educated at Rugby, Bonn, and Cooper's Hill Engineering College, and in 1876 joined the Public Works Department in Bengal. Twelve years later the Tibetans invaded the independent State of Sikkim, and obtained such a dangerous influence over its ruler that the British Government was compelled to send an expedition to turn them out. Mr. White, who had been in the country making roads and bridges, had obtained so much influence over the leading natives that he went with the expedition as Assistant Political Officer, afterwards remaining there for twenty years as British representative. He also improved British relations with Bhutan, and when in 1904 Sir Francis Younghusband was sent to Thibet, Mr. White was appointed his assistant. In 1909 he published his book "Sikkim and Bhutan."

23. Thomas, 1st Earl Brassey, was in his 83rd year, and was the eldest son of a well-known contractor for public works who amassed a large fortune. Lord Brassey was educated at Rugby and at University College, Oxford, where he took honours in the School of Law and Modern History. He entered Parliament as Liberal Member for Liverpool in 1865, and from 1868 to 1886 sat for Hastings. He was made a Civil Lord of the Admiralty in Mr. Gladstone's Government of 1880, and afterwards, becoming Secretary to the Admiralty, he was made a K.C.B. in 1881, and retired with the Government in 1885. After the first Home Rule Bill was defeated in 1886 he withdrew from Hastings, contested one of the divisions of Liverpool and was defeated, and when the Government resigned he was raised to the Peerage. From 1895 to 1900 he was Governor of Victoria, and in 1911 he

was raised to an earldom. Lord Brassey was widely known as a man of great industry and many activities. He was an earnest student of Labour questions, a remarkable yachtsman, and a great authority on naval affairs. He was the first yachtsman to obtain the certificate of the Board of Trade for competency to navigate as master, and his famous yacht the *Sunbeam* was known all over the sea-faring world. Lord Brassey and his first wife, Anna, daughter of John Allnutt of Charles Street, Mayfair, collected treasures from all quarters of the globe, and placed them in a museum at their house in Park Lane. His last voyage in his yacht was to India in 1916, when she was fitted out as a hospital ship and handed over to the Indian Government. Lord Brassey established and maintained the "Naval Annual," the most important survey of naval affairs in existence. Lord Brassey's second wife was the Hon. Sybil de Vere Capell, grand-daughter of the sixth Earl of Essex, by whom he had one daughter. He was succeeded by the only son of his first marriage.

23. **Adolphus Frederick, Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz**, was born in 1882, and was the grandson of the Grand Duchess of Neustrelitz, who was a sister of the late Duke of Cambridge and of the late Duchess of Teck. The deceased Grand Duke succeeded his father in 1914, and was a prey to great melancholia. He led an entirely secluded life, and is

supposed to have had British sympathies. At any rate, he roused himself sufficiently to take some interest in the fate of British officers captured in the war. The Grand Duke went for a walk on the evening of the 21st, and his body was discovered the following day in the Burger Lake, with a gunshot wound in the chest. With his death the Grand Ducal line became extinct, and Strelitz reverted to Schwerin from which it was separated two centuries before.

24. **The Hon. Sir Eric Barrington, K.C.B.**, was 70 years of age, and was a younger son of the sixth Viscount Barrington. He was educated at Eton, and in 1867 entered the Foreign Office where he held high positions under Lord Beaconsfield, Lord Salisbury, Lord Iddesleigh, and Lord Lansdowne. In 1905 he was appointed Assistant Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and retired in 1907. He accompanied Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury to the Berlin Congress of 1878 as second secretary. He married, in 1879, Christina, daughter of the late William Graham.

— **Vice-Admiral H. W. Savory, M.V.O.**, saw active service in the first Ashanti War, 1873-74, and in the Persian Gulf. He went with the Mission under Prince Arthur of Connaught which was sent by King Edward to confer the Order of the Garter on the late Mikado, and himself received the Order of the Rising Sun.

MARCH.

1. **Dr. Charles Coleridge Mackarness** was the eldest son of the late Bishop Mackarness of Oxford, and was born in 1850. He was educated at Winchester and at Oxford where he gained his cricket "Blue," and also played in the University Association Football team. He took his degree in 1878, and was ordained in 1874. After holding several ecclesiastical appointments, he was sent to St. Martin's, Scarborough, which benefice he held for twenty-seven years, doing much for the cause of the Church in the town and diocese. He became a Prebendary of York Minster in 1896 and Archdeacon in 1898. He retired to Oxford in 1916 owing to ill-health.

— **Hubert Howe Bancroft**, the American historian, was in his 86th year. At the age of 16 he entered a bookshop at Buffalo, and from 1852, for sixteen years, he sold books in San

Francisco. He then retired from business and gave his time to historical work. He published a "West American Historical Series" in thirty-nine volumes, and "Chronicles of the Builders of the Commonwealth." In 1905 he sold his collection of documents, which amounted to over 60,000 volumes, to the University of California.

3. **The Rev. David William Forrest, D.D.**, was Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics in the United Free Church College at Glasgow, and was a nominee for the principalship of that College. He was educated at the High School and University of Glasgow, the University of Leipzig, and the United Presbyterian College in Edinburgh. After various appointments he was given his professorship in 1914. In 1901 Dr. Forrest visited Yale University, U.S.A., as special lecturer, and he published two

theological works, and wrote many articles in magazines.

8. Vice - Admiral Sir Charles George Frederick Knowles, Bart., was in his 86th year, and was the only son of Sir Francis Knowles, F.R.S. He entered the Navy in 1845, and received promotion to the rank of Captain in 1872. He became Rear-Admiral in 1889 and Vice-Admiral in 1894. In 1892 he succeeded his father as fourth Baronet. He saw active service in 1852-53 in the Burmese War, and commanded the Niger Expedition in 1864.

— **Prince Mirko of Montenegro,** who was born in 1879, was the second son of the King of that country. In 1916 he entered a sanatorium at Vienna, and his death, which was caused by hæmorrhage of the lungs, took place there.

5. The Rev. Dr. William Walter Merry, Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford, was born in 1835. He was educated at Cheltenham and at Balliol College, Oxford, where he held an open Scholarship and took a First Class in Moderations in 1854, a Second Class in the Final Schools in 1856, a fourth in Natural Science in 1857, and the Latin Essay Prize the following year. He was elected to a Fellowship at Lincoln in 1859, and was Classical Lecturer there for twenty-five years. In 1860 he was ordained deacon, and priest in 1861, and was presented to his own College living of All Saints in 1862. Several times he was Classical Moderator, and on two occasions Select Preacher. In 1880 Dr. Merry was appointed to the post of Public Orator, which he filled to perfection, combining a great gift of lucid expression in both Latin and English, with a beautiful speaking voice, and an appearance which was in accordance with his genial and sympathetic character. He was elected head of his College in 1884. Dr. Merry sat in the Hebdomadal Council from 1902 to 1908, and was Vice-Chancellor from 1904 to 1906. Among his published works his first edition of the "Odyssey" gained a great and immediate success, also his editions of the plays of "Aristophanes."

6. John Redmond, the great leader of the Irish Party in the House of Commons, was born in 1851, and was a member of an old Wexford Roman Catholic family, of Anglo-Norman origin, and Whig traditions. His father was a prominent Home Ruler, and a mem-

ber of Parliament for some years under the leadership of Isaac Butt. John Redmond was educated at Clongowes, and his histrionic and oratorical gifts were in evidence at an early age. Although he was called to the Bar he never practised, but became a clerk in the Vote Office of the House of Commons. When the young man desired to sit for an Irish constituency, he had to apply to Parnell, who had become practically Irish Leader, and it is said that, on hearing his intentions, his brother William telegraphed to him: "For God's sake, don't disgrace the family." Mr. Redmond took his seat as member for New Ross in 1881, and his powers of oratory being quickly recognised he was sent to Australia the following year to collect funds, and from there went to America. His mission was of great service to his party, not only financially (he collected 15,000*l.*), but also by allaying the suspicion with which it was regarded in many quarters owing to the Phoenix Park murders. The fact was that Mr. Redmond was no fanatic, but a true patriot, who was yet capable of appreciating the ideals of civilisation for which Britain stood, and thus he pleaded his cause with a moderation which appealed to overseas audiences removed from the heated atmosphere of party strife. In 1887, however, he was sent to prison for five weeks on a charge of intimidation brought against him by a County Wexford landlord. When Parnell died in 1891, the leadership of the minority which had refused to abandon him fell to Mr. Redmond. The elections of the following year, however, ended disastrously, and the Redmond group in the House numbered only twelve members. He disappointed in many ways of the Home Rule Bill of 1893 which he described as "a toad, ugly and venomous," despite the jewel in its head. He was only able, as the leader of the Irish minority, to join with his Unionist fellow-countrymen in certain movements for the betterment of internal affairs. He sat on the Recess Committee and signed its Report, and expressed his sympathy with the Land Purchase and Local Government Acts of 1896-97. In 1900 the Irish Party was finally reunited under Mr. Redmond's leadership, and he commenced his difficult task, hampered from the first by an element of discord in Nationalist Ireland (*e.g.* among the neo-Fenians) which required careful handling. Probably he was not in favour of the anti-English demonstrations which took place among the Nationalists during

the South African War, and though he himself sat on the Land Conference of 1908, and signed the Report upon which the Wyndham Land Act was founded, even selling a small property of his own on "Conference" terms, he allowed the agitation against the Act to take place with hardly a protest. When Mr. Birrell became Chief Secretary in 1907 he obtained the long-desired National University, and in other matters the party led by Mr. Redmond attained some of its aims, contrary to the wishes of the extremists, whether Unionists or Sinn Feiners. The latter party were never understood by the Nationalist leader, who ignored their demands and disapproved of their ambitions. But Mr. Redmond's greatest triumph was enjoyed when, under the Asquith Governments of 1910 and 1911, he held the balance of power in his hands, and practically directed the Liberal Party's policy. This was noticeable especially in the case of the destruction of the House of Lords' Veto, when he actually demanded that the Prime Minister should, in case of need, force the Bill into law by obtaining guarantees from the King, or should resign. In the event, Mr. Redmond gained his point, and this success even placated the unruly Sinn Fein Party; but it still further alienated the Unionists. Mr. Redmond heartily approved of the Home Rule Bill of 1912, and the fierce opposition of Ulster, with its demand for exclusion from the proposed measure, surprised him, and at first he opposed any such amendment to the Bill. However, the emulation of Ulster's war-like preparations by the more extreme Nationalists caused him in 1913 to consider an amendment, by which Ulster could, by vote, remain outside Home Rule for six years. This compromise was refused by Sir Edward Carson, and the conference, to which the King summoned the leaders of both parties, also failed to arrive at any solution of the dilemma. Matters were therefore at the acutest stage (the volunteers on both sides bearing arms and on occasion using them) when the European War broke out. Then it was that Mr. Redmond showed his unflinching loyalty to the Empire. In the course of an eloquent speech in the House of Commons, he said that the Government might "remove all troops from Ireland," and that Irishmen would then combine to defend their country against any foreign attack. However, Mr. Redmond was not a very enthusiastic supporter of the Imperial Recruiting Campaign in

Ireland. He desired rather to bring the Nationalist Volunteers under Government control to be employed in home defence, but this movement met with no success. The Home Rule Bill was placed upon the Statute Book in September, 1914, but the Suspensory Bill which accompanied it postponed the operation of the Act until the war should have ended, and Mr. Asquith promised the Ulster minority that there should be an amending Bill. This state of things, however, did not satisfy the extreme Nationalists and Sinn Feiners, whose strength Mr. Redmond still under-estimated, and whose seditious speeches and writings he was in favour of ignoring, on the ground that a policy of contempt was the one most likely to put an end to the movement. He refused a seat in the Coalition Government, and worked effectively to secure the exclusion of Ireland from the Registration and Military Service Bills; but he condemned the agitation against the application of war taxes to his country. Although the trouble among the extremists was growing, Mr. Redmond was quite unprepared for the revolt of Easter, 1916, and it met with his severe condemnation. When, to his surprise, the Government began negotiating for a provisional settlement of Home Rule by consent, he took part in the proceedings which were, however, brought to naught by the Sinn Feiners. In July, 1917, the Convention was called, and, until he became too ill to do so, Mr. Redmond played an important part in its deliberations, always speaking and acting on the side of a conciliatory policy. Several serious attacks of illness led to a severe operation which Mr. Redmond faced with great courage. For a few days he seemed relieved, but heart failure supervened and he passed away at his house in London. His body was taken on the following day to Westminster Cathedral where a Requiem was celebrated on March 8. All parties united in honouring a man whose honesty of purpose and charm of character were universally recognised, and his death was truly regarded as a serious loss. Mr. Redmond married Miss Dalton, an Australian lady, by whom he had a son and two daughters.

6. Sir Charles Bine Renshaw, Bart., who was born in 1848, was Member of Parliament for West Renfrewshire from 1892 to 1906. He was educated at St. Clare, Sevenoaks, and in Germany. He was Chairman of Messrs. A. F. Stoddard & Co., carpet

manufacturers, of the Caledonian Railway Co., and of the Board of Referees. He received his baronetcy in 1902. He married, in 1872, Mary Home Stoddard, and had one son, who succeeded him, and four daughters.

10. **Dr. Sybil Louie Lewis** of Hull died after three days' illness, the result of long service abroad, with members of the Scottish Women's Hospitals in Serbia and in Macedonia.

— **Colonel Sir George Malcolm Fox**, who was born in 1848, served in the Black Watch for many years, and was wounded at Tel-el-Kebir in 1882. He was Assistant Inspector of Gymnasia in the Army, and in charge of the headquarters of the system at Aldershot, and his life-work was the higher training of the British soldier in those arts which make for efficiency in hand-to-hand combat. He constructed at his own expense the Army athletic training ground at Aldershot, and introduced boxing instruction, having competent pugilists as teachers. After having done much for swordsmanship, Colonel Fox introduced the Swedish system of physical training for army recruits, and after his retirement he was appointed Inspector of Gymnasia in schools. He was knighted in 1910.

12. **Major-General Lord Blythwood, K.C.B., C.V.O.**, was the third Baron, and was in his 74th year. He was educated at Eton, entered the Scots Guards in 1864, and commanded the first battalion from 1892 to 1896. In 1898 he became Major-General, and in 1900 commanded a brigade at Aldershot. He saw Active Service in the Egyptian Campaign in 1882, and commanded the 16th Brigade in South Africa, 1900-2, and was twice mentioned in dispatches. He was Lieut.-Governor, and Major-General Commanding-in-Chief in Guernsey from 1903 to 1908. He married the late Mildred Catherine Hawley, daughter of Sir J. H. Hawley, Bart., and succeeded to the peerage in 1916. At his death he was succeeded by his eldest son, Brigade-Major the Hon. Archibald Douglas-Campbell-Douglas, D.L.

— **Ernest Wild**, who was serving on a mine-sweeper in the Mediterranean, was a member of the Ross Sea party of the Shackleton Expedition, and was the brother of Frank Wild who was second in command to Sir Ernest Shackleton. It was chiefly

owing to his courageous endeavours that the men left behind were saved, after the *Aurora* had been blown from her bearings off the Ross barrier.

15. **Admiral John William Brackenbury, C.B., C.M.G.**, was 76 years of age. He entered the Navy in 1857, became Rear-Admiral in 1896, and Admiral in 1905 and retired the same year. During the Zulu War in 1879, he commanded a naval brigade, and received the C.M.G. for his services. He also saw Active Service in the Egyptian War of 1882. Admiral Brackenbury married, in 1890, Frances Mary, daughter of the late Colonel Francklyn.

16. **Sir George Alexander**, the well-known actor-manager, was born in 1858. He was the son of a Scotch manufacturer, and was intended for a business career. But while he was apprenticed to a drapery firm in Old Change, he took part in amateur theatricals, and this led to his adopting the stage as a profession in 1879. For two years he played with good companies in the provinces, and was then engaged by Irving for the Lyceum Theatre. There he first played Caleb Decie in Abbey's "Two Roses," and afterwards Paris in "Romeo and Juliet." Playing with Miss Wallis, with Hare and Kendal, and with Miss Mary Anderson, he soon became known, and in 1884 returned to the Lyceum Company, with which he remained for five years. Among his many important parts during this period was that of "Faust." He left the Lyceum in 1889 and went to the Adelphi, and while playing there opened the Avenue Theatre on his own account with "Dr. Bill." A few weeks afterwards he himself appeared in the title-rôle of this farce at his own theatre. This was in March, 1890, and ten months later he moved to the St. James's Theatre, where he started his twenty-seven years' management with "Sunlight and Shadow," by R. C. Carton. At the St. James's, Alexander was in his right element. His unerring taste, and his knowledge of what was required in a West-end Theatre devoted to fashionable comedy, were combined with a happy faculty for choosing plays of interest and real merit. Among the many good plays he produced were, Pinero's "Second Mrs. Tanqueray" and "His House in Order"; Jones's "The Masqueraders"; Wilde's "Lady Windermere's Fan" and "The Importance of being Earnest"; John Oliver Hobbes's "The

Ambassador" and "The Wisdom of the Wise"; Henry James's "Guy Domville"; Stephen Phillips's "Paolo and Francesca"; and Anthony Hope's "Prisoner of Zenda". Alexander's own acting was chiefly remarkable for its charm, a quality which made him something of a popular idol, and which, it may justly be said, was by no means confined to his stage appearances. He was knighted in 1911, was President of the Royal General Theatrical Fund, and was a Member of the London County Council. He married Florence Théleur, to whom was due much of the success of the St. James's productions from the sartorial point of view.

16. The Most Rev. Dr. John Healy, Archbishop of Tuam, was 76 years of age. He was born in County Sligo, educated at a diocesan school and at Maynooth College, and was ordained in 1867. He served as curate and parish priest in the diocese of Elphin, and then was asked to choose between the Chairs of Theology and Classics at Maynooth. He chose the former, and held it until he became Prefect of the Dunboyne establishment in 1882. A little later he was made Titular Bishop of Macra, and Coadjutor of Clonfert to which See he succeeded in 1896, and seven years later was appointed by the Pope Archbishop of Tuam. The Archbishop took a keen interest in education, especially in the establishment of the National University of Ireland. He was a student of the Irish language, and wrote a celebrated life of St. Patrick.

17. The Rev. Henry Scott Holland, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, was born in 1847, and was the son of Mr. George Henry Holland of Dumbleton Hall, Evesham, by his marriage with the daughter of the first Lord Gifford, who was Lord Chief Justice in 1824. He was educated at Eton and Balliol College, Oxford, where in 1870 he graduated with a first class in Lit. Hum. (having previously taken a third class in Moderations) and was, during the same year, elected to a senior studentship of Christ Church, becoming a tutor there in 1872. In 1872 also he was ordained deacon, and in 1874 priest, and very soon became known for his original and inspiring preaching. He became senior proctor in 1882. For fifteen years he worked at Christ Church and had much success as a "Greats" teacher, but during this period he came under the influence of

Dr. Liddon, and his preaching capacities were those which developed the most strongly. Scott Holland was also much drawn towards Dr. Benson, then Bishop of Truro, and even wrote to Mr. Gladstone urging that he should be appointed to the Primacy. When this occurred, the new Bishop (Wilkinson) of Truro appointed Scott Holland as Honorary Canon of St. Petroc in that Cathedral, and also made him his examining chaplain, a position which he retained for many years. In 1884 Mr. Gladstone made him a Canon of St. Paul's, and two years later he became Precentor. In 1898 he refused the See of Norwich offered to him by Mr. Gladstone, in which he probably acted wisely, as he was scarcely fitted to administer a straggling agricultural diocese. In 1910 he was appointed to the Regius Professorship at Oxford, which appointment was received with some surprise, but could really be accounted for by Scott Holland's wide sympathies, and an abiding youthfulness which made him able to work well with various groups in the theological faculty, and to appeal to the modern type of Oxford man. Scott Holland was undoubtedly best known as a preacher. The influence of Liddon, while it developed his gifts in this line, was quite incapable of checking his originality of thought and expression. Whether in the pulpit at St. Paul's, or at a meeting to promote missionary effort or social reform, his burning eloquence, rapid utterance, and unswerving vindication of what he held to be the truth, utterly regardless of public opinion on the matter in question, were bound to carry away his hearers. A strong sense of humour, together with an affectionate disposition, and a charming personal humility, made him the much-loved friend of many generations of Oxford men. Dr. Scott Holland's connexion with the Christian Social Union was long and fruitful. He edited the "Commonwealth" for many years, and contributed to it the "Personal Studies," which were issued in book form in 1905. He was also the author of the essay on "Faith" in "Lux Mundi," of seven or eight volumes of sermons, and of a life of the great singer, Jenny Lind.

17. Richard Barry O'Brien, the Irish biographer and historical writer, was 71. While a student at the Dublin Catholic University, he was, like many others of his day, carried away by the movement then in full swing for setting up an Irish Republic in defiance of Great Britain. In 1869, however, he

came to London to finish his studies for the English and Irish Bars, and the reading of John Bright's speeches on the Irish question, and the hearing of Mr. Gladstone's concluding speech in the Disestablishment of the Irish Church debate moderated his views. He became convinced that Englishmen were more in sympathy with Irish aspirations than he had believed possible, and he came in consequence to the conclusion that his country's grievances might be remedied by constitutional means. For many years he was adviser to Parnell, and later to Redmond, a position for which he was well qualified owing to his devotion to his country, his knowledge both of her history and of parliamentary procedure, and his good sense. When Mr. Redmond made his famous speech at the outbreak of war, declaring it to be Ireland's duty to stand by Great Britain, Mr. O'Brien supported him heartily, and three of his sons at once enlisted in the Army. Mr. O'Brien was one of the founders of the Irish Literary Society of London, and published many books on Irish questions, and also "A Hundred Years of Irish History." He married, in 1877, Miss Kathleen Mary Teevan, by whom he had a large family.

19. **Sir Robert Romer, G.C.B.**, was in his 78th year. He was educated at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, where he held a scholarship, and in 1863 was Senior Wrangler, being the first member of his college to attain that particular distinction. He also rowed in the Cambridge boat. He was elected to a law studentship in the college and, four years after taking his degree, to a Fellowship. In 1864 Mr. Romer married a daughter of Mark Lemon, and in 1867 was called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn, and soon started to practise. After a few years he became known as the "fashionable junior," and was so well liked both by the Bench and Bar that he was able on occasion to ignore the customary etiquette and to take his own line with impunity. He took silk in 1881, and attached himself for a time to the Court of the Master of the Rolls, but later he joined Mr. Justice Chitty's Court, and quickly gained a very large share of the work at that inner Bar. One of his great cases was that of the London Financial Association *v.* Kelk, which lasted nearly thirty days, and in which twenty-two counsel were engaged. In 1884 he wished to enter Parliament, and contested Brighton in the Liberal interest, but was unsuccessful. He became a Liberal Unionist after 1886. In 1890

he was appointed a Judge of the Chancery Division, where he proved himself expeditious, with a great knowledge of the world, and a rapid discernment of character. He was also gifted with great clear-headedness and the faculty of lucid expression. He was appointed a Lord Justice of Appeal in 1899, and in this capacity he presided over one of the inquiries which were made after the Boer War. He was also a member of the Royal Commission on University Education. Sir Robert Romer lost his wife in 1916 and he left five sons, each of whom attained to a distinguished position; he also left one daughter.

22. **The Rev. J. H. Gybbon Spilsbury, Ph.D.**, was 73 years of age, and was an accomplished linguist. He was educated at Paris and Louvain Universities, and spent much of his life in South America where he studied the native languages, particularly the Quichua dialect. He published a Quichua grammar and a translation of St. John's Gospel in that tongue. Dr. Spilsbury was so well skilled in Spanish that he was actually appointed Professor of Spanish Literature at the National College, Concepcion del Uruguay, in 1892. When travelling as Special Commissioner on Education for the Argentine Republic he made a valuable collection of relics of the Inca civilisation.

— **Vice-Admiral William Usborne Moore**, whose age was 69, commanded for many years H.M. surveying vessels in Australian, South Pacific, Chinese, and home waters. He entered the *Britannia* in 1862, joined H.M.S. *Revenge* as a midshipman in 1863, and subsequently served as assistant surveyor on board H.M. ships *Newport* and *Sheerwater*. When he was 26 years of age he was put in charge of a survey and was in command of the *Alacrity* for five years, surveying the Fiji Islands. From 1882 to 1885 he was also Deputy-Commissioner of the South-West Pacific, and was promoted commander in the latter year, and appointed to the *Rambler* on the China Station. In 1890 he commanded the *Penguin* in Australia, and was promoted to the rank of captain in 1892, and from 1895 to 1900 he held the command of the home survey on board H.M.S. *Research*. His most notable achievement was the triangulation extending along the coast of China for many hundreds of miles.

24. **Sir John Anderson, G.C.M.G., K.C.B.**, Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Ceylon, was born in 1858, and took his M.A. degree at Aberdeen in 1877 with first-class honours, and was awarded the gold medal presented to the most distinguished graduate of the year. He entered the Colonial Office as a second-class clerk in 1879, and in 1891 was appointed Joint Commissioner with the late Sir J. F. Dickson to inquire into various affairs in connexion with the registry of the Supreme Court of Gibraltar. In 1892 he was attached to the Staff of the British Agent for the Behring Sea Arbitration in London and Paris, and became a first-class clerk and a principal clerk in 1896 and 1897 respectively. He was Secretary to two Colonial Conferences in 1897 and 1902, and in 1901 was in attendance on the then Duke of Cornwall and York on his visit to the Colonies, in which capacity he represented the Colonial Office. Sir John became Governor of the Straits Settlements in 1904, and High Commissioner for the Federated Malay States at the same time. In 1911 he was made Permanent Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, and in 1915 took up his post in Ceylon. Sir John Anderson was unmarried.

26. **M. Claude Debussy** was 55 years of age, and was the exponent in music of the ideas of Mallarmé, Maeterlinck, and Eugène Carrière. He was one of the greatest musicians of his generation; one who broke away from the slavish imitation of the German school, and expressed in a marvellous manner the genius of modern France. Three of his greatest and most epoch-making works are, the

String Quartet, and "L'Après-midi d'un Faune," published in 1893, and "Pelléas and Mélisande" in 1902. M. Debussy's delicacy of treatment of his themes was at once acute and forceful to a remarkable degree, and he may be said to have inaugurated a new development of the inheritance bequeathed by the greatest musicians of the past.

26. **Thomas Holmes**, the well-known criminologist, was 73 years of age. He was born of poor parents at the little village of Pelsall, near Walsall, and having had a little education at the Church School became an ironmoulder at 10 years of age, in which occupation he remained for thirty-one years. During this time he married, and brought up five children, and devoted his spare time to educating his fellow-workers at the Sunday school and evening classes. Being obliged to change his employment owing to an accident which partially disabled him, he spent the next twenty years as Police Court Missionary at Lambeth, where he devoted all his powers to the outcasts of society, and in 1900 published his exceedingly successful book "Pictures and Problems from London Police Courts." In 1905 Mr. Holmes became Secretary to the Howard Association for the reform of prisons and criminal law, and at this he worked with great success for ten years. In 1914 he founded "The Home-Workers' Aid Association" which was intended to improve the conditions under which home workers lived, and to help them towards the enjoyment of an annual holiday. For this purpose Mr. Holmes built a beautiful house at Walton-on-the-Naze.

APRIL.

2. **Charles Mitchell**, the famous pugilist, was born in 1861, and became a teacher of fencing before he was 20, and to this art he probably owed the easy poise and good judgment of distance in the ring for which he was remarkable.

4. **Alfred Henry Carter, M.D., M.Sc.**, was in his 70th year. He was a well-known and distinguished consulting physician in Birmingham, being Professor of Medicine at the University, Physician to the Queen's Hospital, and Professor of Physiology at Queen's College, and was prominent in religious and social work. He was

a keen Churchman, and was for a time treasurer of the Christian Social Union in which work he assisted Bishop Gore. Dr. Carter retired to Abingdon at the beginning of the war, but in company with Sir Victor Horsley he took charge of Sir Henry Norman's Hospital at Wimereux. Later he went successively to the Military Hospital at Boulogne, and twice to and from Mudros as head of a large staff in charge of sick and wounded. Dr. Carter published a widely read book "The Elements of Practical Medicine."

5. **The Right Rev. Norman Dumenil John Straton, D.D.**, who

was formerly Bishop of Sodor and Man, and then of Newcastle, was born in 1840, and was the son of the late Rev. G. W. Straton, Rector of Aylestone. He was educated privately and at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took his degree in 1862. In 1865 he was ordained deacon, and within a year priest also, and served a curacy at Market Drayton. In 1866 he was appointed Vicar of Kirkby Wharfe, and in 1875 Vicar of All Saints, Wakefield, and Rural Dean. Here he became well known as an energetic promoter of Protestant principles in the Church, and in 1888 was made Archdeacon of Huddersfield. Dr. Straton had been one of the secretaries of the endowment fund for the new Bishopric of Wakefield, and Dr. Walsham How, as the first Bishop, became his diocesan. Dr. Straton's extreme Protestantism did not meet with sympathy on the part of the Bishop, with whom, however, he had no quarrel. In 1892 Lord Salisbury offered Dr. Straton the Bishopric of Sodor and Man, which he accepted. The recent traditions of this diocese had been Evangelical, and the Bishop worked vigorously to supply its needs. In 1907 Dr. Straton, although a pronounced Tory, was offered the Bishopric of Newcastle (in preference to many clergy of different political views), by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman. At Newcastle, however, the particular line of action with regard to the High Church party which was pursued by the new Bishop led to considerable friction, not only with the parish clergy, but also with important members of the Cathedral Chapter. Therefore the conditions of work were not pleasant, notwithstanding the success gained in some directions, which was attested to by the expansion of diocesan funds, and in 1916, Dr. Straton resigned his See. He married, in 1873, Miss Pease of Hesselewood, Hull, who died in 1916.

12. Lieutenant Sir Robert Muir Mackenzie, Bart., M.C., Durham Light Infantry, was born in 1891, and succeeded to the baronetcy on the death of his father in February, 1918. Sir Robert was at Jesus College, Cambridge, before joining his regiment, and in 1914 married the younger daughter of the late Henry Jones of Cardiff, by whom he had, in 1917, a son to whom his title descended.

13. Lord De Mauley, the third baron, was 75 years of age, and was unmarried. He was at one time in

the Rifle Brigade, and had been aide-de-camp to the Governor-General of Canada, and succeeded his father in 1896. He was missing for over a week before his death became known, and his body was subsequently found about 90 miles from Yeovil whence he had started on a bicycle to visit his brother, the Rev. the Hon. Maurice J. G. Ponsonby, Hon. Canon of Bristol, and Vicar of Wantage. It was presumed that he had died from exhaustion. Canon Ponsonby, his brother, succeeded him.

13. Thomas Francis Fremantle, second Baron Cottesloe, and a Baron of the Austrian Empire, was 88 years of age. He was educated at Eton and Balliol College, Oxford, and took a first class in Classics in 1852. He became Conservative Member for Bucks in 1876, in succession to Lord Beaconsfield, and retained his seat until 1885. He was at one time Deputy-Lieutenant for the county of Bucks; and had also been Chairman of Quarter Sessions of the County Council, and of the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway. He succeeded his father in 1890. Lord Cottesloe married, in 1859, the Lady Augusta Henrietta Scott, second daughter of the second Earl of Eldon. He was succeeded by his eldest son, Lieut.-Colonel the Hon. Thomas Francis Fremantle, V.D., M.A., D.L.

— **Guy Elliston,** financial secretary and business manager of the British Medical Association, was 46 years of age, and was the son of the late Dr. Elliston of Ipswich. He was for nineteen years in the service of the Association, and had to provide for the rebuilding of its premises in the Strand, and to arrange to supply the funds which were required by the Insurance Act of 1911. In 1906 a medical insurance agency was established, with Mr. Elliston as its secretary, and his able management made possible considerable yearly donations to medical charities out of its surplus funds.

16. Sir William Liston-Foulis, Bart., of Colinton, was the eldest son of the ninth Baronet, and was in his 49th year. He succeeded his father in 1896, and was the owner of an estate of about 8,000 acres in Mid-Lothian. He was succeeded by his brother, Lieut.-Colonel C. J. Liston-Foulis.

17. Colonel George Adolphus Jacob, whose age was 77, belonged to the well-known Anglo-Indian family that numbered the founder of Jacob's

Horse as one of its members. He went to India when he was only 16, and being stationed in the Bombay Presidency became a master of the Marathi tongue, and later acted as Examiner in Sanskrit and Marathi for Bombay University. For many years Colonel Jacob, as Director of Military Education in the Bombay Army, resided at Poona, and here he pursued the study of Sanskrit with such ardour as to become the first European authority on the poetics of that language, and one of the profoundest scholars of Indian classical literature. He published editions of philosophical works, and a "Concordance to the Principal Upanishads and the Bhagavad Gita," also a "Manual of Indian Pantheism." A few years before his death, the University of Cambridge conferred upon Colonel Jacob the honorary degree of Litt.D.

18. **Samuel Young**, the Nationalist M.P. for East Cavan, was 96 years of age, and was the oldest member of the House of Commons. He was aged 70 when he first took his seat. The son of a Presbyterian farmer, Mr. Young had a successful career in commerce, as partner first in a wholesale woollen merchant's business, and from 1872 as senior partner in the firm of Messrs. Young, King & Co., whisky distillers and blenders. He was a member of the Royal Commission on the Licensing Laws in 1896, and until a year before his death, when his health began to fail, was constant in his attention to his Parliamentary duties. He published several essays on political and theological subjects. Mr. Young married, in 1846, a daughter of Edward Allen of Fenchurch Street, by whom he had twelve children.

— **The Rev. James Heron, D.D.**, was Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Church Polity, and Pastoral Theology at the Presbyterian Church Assembly's College in Belfast. He was born in 1836, and was educated at Belfast and Edinburgh, and was ordained to the Ministry in 1861. He held the Chair of Church History at Belfast from 1889, and was Moderator in 1901. He published various theological works, including "A Short History of Puritanism."

20. **Duke Friedrich II. of Anhalt**, who was in his 82nd year, succeeded his father in 1904. He was a General in the Prussian Army, and was married, but had no children. He

was succeeded by his brother, Prince Leopold.

21. **William Hoey**, Lecturer in Hindustani to the University of Oxford, was educated at Belfast, and entered the Indian Civil Service in 1870. For nearly thirty years he was engaged in district work in the United Provinces, and at one time was occupied in archaeological exploration in the Gonda District. In 1900 he retired, and a few years later was appointed to his Oxford lectureship. Mr. Hoey published some works dealing with ancient Indian history.

22. **The Right Rev. John Rundle Cornish, D.D.**, Bishop Suffragan of St. Germans, was born in 1837 at Tavistock, and was educated at Bideford Grammar School and at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge. He was 14th Wrangler in 1859 and became a Fellow of his College, and while still there in 1863 was ordained. In 1868 he was made Vicar of St. John's, Truro; six years later he became Vicar of Verran, and in 1883 he accepted the living of Kenwyn, which he held for thirty-three years. Dr. Cornish acted as examining chaplain to each in succession of the five Bishops of Truro, and was made Principal of Truro Diocesan Training College in 1873, and was Archdeacon of Cornwall from 1888 to 1916. He was consecrated Bishop in 1906, and during the frequent illnesses of his diocesan, Dr. Stubbs, he was his extremely active representative, winning the affection and respect of all classes, including Nonconformists. He married, in 1874, Miss Barham of Truro.

23. **The Viscount Ipswich, R.A.F.** and Coldstream Guards, who was killed while flying in Wiltshire, was 84 years of age, and was the only son of the Earl of Euston and grandson of the Duke of Grafton. He was educated at Harrow and Trinity College, Cambridge, and had been wounded while serving in France with the Coldstream Guards. In 1913 Lord Ipswich married Auriol Margaretta, daughter of Major Brougham, of Pettersbury House, Northamptonshire, by whom he had a son in 1914.

27. **Sir Samuel Bagster Boulton, Bart., J.P., D.L., F.R.G.S.**, was Chairman and part founder of Burt, Boulton & Haywood (Ltd.), timber merchants and contractors, and was in his 88th year. He was also Chairman of the Dominion Tar and Chemical Company (Ltd.) and of the British

Australian Timber Company (Ltd.) and of the London Labour Conciliation and Arbitration Board from 1889 to 1913. In this last capacity he presided over the settlement of many labour disputes. From 1893 to 1898 he was Vice-President of the London Chamber of Commerce, and from 1898 to 1902 President of the West Ham Chamber of Commerce. Sir Samuel was a Knight of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, and received the Telford Medal of the Institute of Civil Engineers in 1884. In 1855 he married Miss Sophia Louisa Cooper, and had a family of two sons and five daughters. He was succeeded by his son, Harold Edwin Boulton, C.V.O., M.V.O.

27. **Mrs. Gertrude Tennant**, who was in her 99th year, was the eldest daughter of Vice-Admiral H. T. B. Collier, whose wife was a direct descendant of Oliver Cromwell. Mrs. Tennant was brought up and educated entirely in France, not coming to London until she was 24. She married Mr. Charles Tennant, M.P., the great philanthropist, when she was 27. Both before and after his death in 1873 Mrs. Tennant entertained numerous celebrities at her house in Whitehall, and among her English friends were Mr. Gladstone and John Bright, while Flaubert and Gambetta were among a host of French friends. After Mrs. Tennant's daughter married Sir H. M. Stanley, the explorer, in 1890, Mrs. Tennant herself accompanied them on two lecturing tours in the United States and the colonies. Besides her deep knowledge of English and French literature, and her remarkable memory and conversational powers, Mrs. Tennant was an artist of no small ability.

— **Lieut. - Colonel the Hon. George Herbert Windsor Windsor-Clive** was born in 1835, and was the son of the Baroness Windsor and the Hon. R. H. Clive. He was educated at Eton, and served first in the 52nd Light Infantry and afterwards in the Coldstream Guards. From 1860 to 1885 he represented Ludlow in the House of Commons in the Conservative interest.

28. **Charles Dickens Gordon**, who was 68 years of age, was a godson of Charles Dickens, and grandson of Professor John Wilson (Christopher North). He was ordained in 1873 and was for some years Vicar of Walsham-le-Willows, Suffolk. Subsequently he

joined the Church of Rome. He was a good linguist and extempore preacher and possessed literary ability. He was private secretary at one time to Lord Milner.

28. **Professor Nelson Fraser, M.A.**, was Principal of the Training College for Teachers in Government Secondary Schools in Bombay. He was a distinguished linguist and Oriental scholar, and published studies and translations of the saints and poets of the Deccan.

— **James Wilson Hyde, T.S.O.**, was born in 1841, and was Controller of the Sorting Office at the General Post Office, Edinburgh, for twenty-eight years. He was also well known socially as possessing a charming personality and being deeply interested in literature, music, and art.

— **William Scott, A.R.I.B.A.**, was 69 years of age, and was the author and illustrator of works on the Riviera country. He was an honorary member of the Royal Academy of Venice, and first officer of the Order of the Crown of Italy.

— **Lady Knowles** was the widow of the founder and editor of the *Nineteenth Century*, and with her husband she held what almost resembled a French "salon" in London where distinguished men and women of different professions and nationalities met and discussed matters of public interest in the worlds of art, science, literature, and politics.

30. **Charles Alexander Douglas-Home, K.T.**, twelfth Earl of Home, was in his 85th year. He was the son of the eleventh Earl and Lucy, daughter of Baron Montagu of Boughton. Lord Home was educated at Eton and at Trinity College, Cambridge. He was Hon. Colonel of the 3rd and 4th Scottish Rifles, and Major-General of the Royal Company of Archers, and was Lord-Lieutenant of the counties of Berwickshire and Lanarkshire successively. He was A.D.C. to Queen Victoria from 1887 to 1897. Lord Home married, in 1870, Maria, daughter of the late Captain Conrad Grey, R.N., and had one son, who succeeded him, and four daughters. He succeeded his father in 1881. The lands and castle of Home were granted to his ancestor William of Home by William the Lion about 1214.

MAY.

3. **William Frederick Yeames, R.A.**, was born in 1835 in Russia, and was the son of the British Consul at Taganrog. He studied art in London and Florence, was elected A.R.A. in 1866 and R.A. in 1878. Mr. Yeames was much liked both by his pupils in the Royal Academy School, and by his colleagues on the Council, of which he was an important member. He was also librarian for a long time at the Royal Academy, and Curator of the Painted Hall, Greenwich Hospital. As an artist Mr. Yeames belonged to what was called "the St. John's Wood School," and like other members of that school painted historical pictures, easily understood, which were at one time popular, though the later Pre-Raphaelites and Impressionists revolted against their conventionality. Two of Mr. Yeames' best-known works are "Amy Robsart" (1877) and "The Toast of the Kit-Cat Club" (1884). He married Miss Winfield, a niece of Sir David Wilkie, R.A.

5. **Georges Ohnet**, the French novelist and dramatist, was born in 1848, and was educated at the Lycée Bonaparte with a view to becoming a lawyer. At the commencement of his legal career, however, he turned his thoughts to journalism, and after the war of 1870-71 edited successively *Le Pays* and the *Constitutionnel*. He was also a prolific writer of novels and plays, the most famous of which, "Le Maître de Forges," was published in book form in 1881, and dramatised in 1883. It gained a great success in Paris and also in England where, under the title of "The Ironmaster," it was produced by Mr. and Mrs. Kendal.

— **Sir Richard Hungerford Pollen, Bart.**, of Rodbourne, near Malmesbury, was 72 years of age. He was a well-known county magnate, and was chairman for many years of the Malmesbury magisterial bench. He was succeeded by his son.

6. **Murray Marks**, the well-known art dealer and connoisseur of Bond Street, was in his 78th year. His family was of distinguished Dutch origin. Mr. Marks was a man of high probity, great expert knowledge, and unerring taste. He was the trusted adviser of great collectors like Salting, Huth, and Pierpont Morgan, and a generous benefactor of the Victoria and Albert Museum. He was one of

the earliest dealers to import blue and white Oriental porcelain.

7. **Sir William Haswell Stephenson** was in his 82nd year. He was the son of William Stephenson of Throckley, Northumberland, and succeeded his father in the control of the coal company of that name. He was extensively interested in business in Northumbria, and in the coal trade in particular, and in the improvement of the river Tyne as a means of commercial development. He was Mayor of Newcastle-upon-Tyne four times, and three times Lord Mayor, and his municipal activities included the erection of libraries. Sir William was a leading member of the Wesleyan denomination, and a local preacher, and was a generous benefactor to all charitable causes. He was knighted in 1900.

10. **Colonel C. G. Tottenham**, of Ballycurry, Co. Wicklow, was the seventh of his name in direct succession to represent (1868-68 and 1878-80) the borough of New Ross in Parliament. He was educated at Eton, and received his commission in the Scots Fusilier Guards with whom he fought in the Crimean War. He married Catherine, daughter of the Rev. the Hon. Sir Francis Stapleton of Gray's Court, Oxfordshire.

11. **Leonard Henry, Baron Courtney of Penwith**, was the son of a Penzance banker, and was born in 1832. He was educated privately and at St. John's College, Cambridge, and was Second Wrangler in 1855, being bracketed equal with the Senior Wrangler as Smith's Prizeman. He became a Fellow of his College, and in 1858 was called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn. He then took up literary and journalistic work, and in 1877 began his parliamentary career as member for Liskeard. He came quickly to the fore as an opponent of the policy of the Beaconsfield Government in foreign, Indian, and Colonial affairs, and on being again returned as member for Liskeard in 1889, when the Liberals came into power, he became successively Under-Secretary for the Home Department and at the Colonial Office. This latter appointment he only held for nine months, and in 1882 Mr. Gladstone promoted him to the Financial Secretaryship of the Treasury, where he remained for two years, and where

his administrative capacity was recognised. Mr. Courtney was a keen advocate of Proportional Representation, and after vigorously opposing the Franchise Bill of 1884 he resigned his seat. He was, however, elected as Liberal Member for Bodmin in 1885, but again found himself obliged to oppose his leader on the Home Rule question. Under the Unionist Government of 1886 he became Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker in the House of Commons; he was made a Privy Councillor in 1889, and became a Bencher of Lincoln's Inn the same year. In the Parliament of 1892 he acted with great independence, opposing the Home Rule Bill of 1893, and advocating the cause of Woman Suffrage. When Mr. Speaker Peel retired in 1895, Mr. Courtney was offered the support of the Government as a candidate for the Chair, but he declined to be put forward. He was again Member for Bodmin in the Parliament of 1895, but after he had advocated the evacuation of Egypt, and had identified himself with the "stop the war" party during the conflict with the Boers he alienated his supporters, and in 1900 he was not chosen as Unionist candidate for Bodmin. The Campbell-Bannerman Government, however, gave him a peerage, and he continued to maintain his independent position in the Upper House, though his views on Home Rule changed and he became one of the supporters of that policy. During the European War he took the gloomiest view of the possible results to Great Britain, and advocated peace by negotiation as the only way out of the terrible conflict. Lord Courtney's last political controversy was on behalf of Proportional Representation, and it was a melancholy fact that his death should have occurred just before the triumph of the cause of Woman Suffrage which he had so much at heart. As a speaker Lord Courtney was clear, vigorous, and masterly, but without graces of style or manner, and his character in private life reflected that extreme and forcible independence of thought and speech which made him remarkable in politics. He married, in 1888, Miss Catherine Potter.

12. Dr. Richard Grainger Hebb, M.A., M.D., F.R.C.P., F.R.M.S., was consulting physician at Westminster Hospital, consulting pathologist at Queen Charlotte's Hospital, Reader in Morbid Anatomy at the University of London, and editor of the *Journal of the Royal Microscopical Society*.

13. Sir Alexander Pedler, C.I.E., F.R.S., F.C.S., F.I.C., who died suddenly at a committee meeting at the Ministry of Munitions, was in his 69th year. He was educated at the City of London School, and at the Royal College of Science, and became Professor of Chemistry at the Calcutta Presidential College in 1873. He was a keen student of Meteorology, and in 1877 became Meteorological Reporter to the Bengal Government. He was made Principal of his College in 1896, and in 1899 was appointed Director of Public Instruction in Bengal, where he greatly distinguished himself, and was also Vice-Chancellor of Calcutta University. After his retirement in 1914, Sir Alexander served in connexion with scientific research in the Munitions Department. He was knighted in 1906, and was twice married.

14. Henry George Percy, K.G., P.C., seventh Duke of Northumberland, was born in 1846 and was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. When he was 22 years of age he entered the House of Commons, and for seventeen years was keenly interested in political life. His speeches were marked by a forcible clearness which, combined with his devotion to his duties as a Member, made for success in Parliament. But as time went on his extremely rigid Conservative views and disbelief in democracy as a system of Government put him out of sympathy with modern ideas. He was called to the House of Peers as Lord Lovaine of Alnwick in 1887, and succeeded to the dukedom on his father's death in 1899 when he was made a K.G. The Duke's political opinions being what they were, his greatest mark was made as a county leader. He was Chairman of the Northumberland County Council for twenty-three years, and Lord Lieutenant for fourteen years, and much as he disliked many of the laws which he had to administer, his devotion to duty, self-discipline, and force of character made his work in these capacities a remarkable success. As Hon. Colonel of a battalion of the Northumberland Fusiliers he was one of the creators of the County Territorial Association. The Court appointments held by the Duke included that of treasurer to Queen Victoria's household in 1874-75, and he was Lord High Steward at the Coronation of King George in 1911, when he bore St. Edward's crown. From his mother, who was a daughter of Mr. Henry Drummond, M.P., the Duke inherited the estate of Albury Park, Surrey, on which is built a

church for the Irvingites, of which body he was a member. In 1868 the Duke married Lady Edith Campbell, daughter of the eighth Duke of Argyll, by whom he had a large family. He was succeeded by his eldest surviving son, Alan Ian, Earl Percy.

14. **James Gordon Bennett**, the well-known owner of the *New York Herald*, who died at Nice, was born in 1841. He was of mixed Scotch and Irish descent, and when his father (who established the famous paper in 1895) died in 1872 he became possessed of the control of the journal. He lived chiefly in Paris, or on board his yacht, but his activities in the management of the *Herald* were not interrupted on this account. Mr. Bennett was a man of great originality, his methods of work were peculiar, and his conduct frequently erratic. Perhaps his two most remarkable achievements were in connexion with Sir H. M. Stanley who was commissioned by him to find Livingstone, in which quest Bennett was prepared to spend unlimited money. Also in 1874 he bore half the expenses of Stanley's Congo Expedition, and in 1879 he fitted out the Jeannette Polar Expedition. His interest in seafaring matters was notoriously keen, and they occupied a prominent place in his journals. He was himself a famous yachtsman, and sailed two races across the Atlantic, and he also took much interest in motoring and aviation. For the political conduct of the *Herald* Mr. Bennett took his own line, and though the paper was nominally in sympathy with the Democrats, its owner did not hesitate to oppose the party in its columns when their actions met with his disapproval.

16. **Eusapia Palladino**, the famous medium, was born in 1854 in a village of La Pouille. When serving as a kitchen-maid in a Naples family she was asked to join in a spiritualistic séance, and this led to the discovery of her mediumistic powers. These were afterwards investigated by many persons famous in the scientific world, and some of the phenomena produced could not be satisfactorily explained; but on other occasions the medium was convicted of fraud.

— **Mrs. Munro-Ferguson** was the widow of Colonel Munro-Ferguson to whom she was married in 1859, and was the mother of Sir Ronald Crawford Munro-Ferguson, who became Governor-General of Australia in 1914.

17. **Major-General John Swiney**, Madras Staff Corps, was in his 87th year. He was educated at Cheltenham, being one of that College's earliest pupils. In 1849 he received his commission in the Madras Native Infantry, and he took part in the suppression of the Mutiny. He married a daughter of the late Major John Biggs.

20. **W. L. Abingdon**, the well-known melodramatic actor, was born in 1859. He made his first appearance in Belfast in 1881, and subsequently became famous as a villain on the London stage. Some of his best-known parts were "Monks" in "Oliver Twist," "Judge Jefferies" in "Sweet Nell of Old Drury," and "Dr. Moriarty" in "Sherlock Holmes." He also toured in America, and he died in New York.

23. **Admiral Sir Gerard Noel, G.C.B., K.C.M.G.**, was 73 years of age. He entered the Navy in 1866, and was made lieutenant when he was 21. After serving in China he passed with distinction through a gunnery course at Portsmouth, and was there appointed gunnery lieutenant of the flagship *Minotaur* in the Channel. He served subsequently with distinction on the West Coast of Africa, was promoted to commander in 1874, and was appointed in 1878 to the Royal yacht, becoming captain in 1881. After a few years on half-pay and of service in the Mediterranean he was appointed in 1891 captain of the *Nile*, which his action saved from the fate of the *Victoria* in 1893. For the next four years he acted as a Junior Sea Lord at the Admiralty, attaining flag rank in 1896, and in 1897 became second in command in the Mediterranean. This was during the disturbances in Crete, and Sir Gerard's stern and determined treatment of the miscreants who, on September 6, at Candia, massacred 800 native Christians and attacked the small British force in occupation of the Custom House, causing sixty casualties, was rewarded somewhat inadequately with the K.C.M.G. The Turkish Governor was forced to hand over the ringleaders to the British Admiral, who had them court-martialed and shot, and the Concert of the Powers ordered the withdrawal of Turkish troops from the island. Sir Gerard subsequently commanded the Home Fleet, and the China Station, and in 1906 was made Commander-in-Chief at the Nore. He was promoted in 1908 to Admiral of the Fleet, and retired in 1915. He married, in 1875, Rachel,

daughter of Mr. F. J. Cresswell, by whom he had a son and two daughters.

23. Sidney Ball, who was well known for many years in Oxford as senior treasurer of the Union Society, senior tutor and Fellow of St. John's College, and a Liberal leader, was born in 1857. He was educated at Wellington, and in 1875 won a scholarship at Oriel College. His whole life was wrapped up in that of the University where he was much liked and held in great respect. In 1910 he was appointed Travelling Fellow of St. John's, and in this capacity he travelled widely, and became a centre in Oxford for welcoming foreign students. He married Miss Butlin of Ealing, by whom he had one daughter.

29. Arthur W. J. W. B. T. Hill, sixth Marquess of Downshire, was in his 47th year. He succeeded his father in '874. After being educated at Eton he held commissions in the Derbyshire and the Berkshire Yeomanry successively. He was hereditary constable of Hillsborough Fort, and D.L. for County Down, and during the Great War was a special constable. He married first Kathleen Mary, daughter of the Hon. Hugh Hare, in 1893, and having divorced her in 1902, in 1907 he married the daughter of Mr. Foster of Clewer Manor. His son, the Earl of Hillsborough, succeeded him.

JUNE.

3. Louis Barnett Abrahams, who was 79 years of age, was from 1898 to 1907 Head Master of the Jews' Free School, Bell Lane, London, which was founded in 1770, and was brought by him to the position of the largest public elementary school in the world. He introduced many improvements into the system of teaching, and established a uniformed cadet corps. Mr. Abrahams was the first editor of the *Jewish Record*, and published several volumes of school books.

4. Robert Adam Phillips Haldane-Duncan, third Earl of Camperdown, was born in 1841, and was the great-grandson of Admiral Duncan, famous for his victory over the Dutch in 1797. Lord Camperdown was educated at Eton and Balliol College, Oxford, where he took a first class in classics. In 1867 he succeeded his father, and from 1868 to 1870, as a member of Mr. Gladstone's first Administration, he served as a Lord-in-Waiting, and from 1870 to 1874 as Civil Lord of the Admiralty. When the Home Rule controversy caused a split in the Liberal party, Lord Camperdown adhered to the Unionists, and throughout his life remained one of their staunch supporters. He was a keen Imperialist and took much interest in public affairs. As Chairman of the Forfarshire County Council he gave much time and work to the conduct of its business, and was both respected and liked by those who associated with him. Lord Camperdown never married, and his successor was his brother, the Hon. George Alexander Phillips Haldane-Duncan.

5. Charles Warren Fairbanks, United States Senator, and formerly Vice-President, was 66 years of age. He was descended from a New England Puritan family, and was born in a log cabin in Ohio. After graduating at the Wesleyan University in that State, he worked for a time as a journalist, but in 1874 he fulfilled his youthful ambitions by being admitted to the Ohio Bar. He married the same year. At Indianapolis, where he made his home, he gained a large practice and came to the fore in politics, and in 1897 he was elected Senator for Indiana. The following year he became Chairman of the American Commissioners in the Joint High Commission at Quebec for the adjustment of questions which had arisen between the United States and Canada. In 1904 Fairbanks was adopted by the Republican Chicago Convention as candidate for the Vice-Presidency and was duly elected. After his term of office had expired he made a tour of the world and visited London. His British sympathies were pronounced, and also his belief in the underlying friendship between his country and Great Britain.

— **W. B. Duffield**, barrister-at-law, was born in 1861, and was educated at Harrow and at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, where he took a first in the History Tripos in 1885. He practised in London and on the Home Circuit, but was best known as a writer of scholarly and brilliant articles on historical and other kindred subjects. He was a member of the Eighty Club.

8. **Prince Victor Duleep Singh** was 51 years of age, and was the son of the Maharajah of Lahore, who, in consequence of Sikh invasions of British territory, was deposed in 1849. He was granted a pension and settled in England, where the young Prince was educated at Eton and Cambridge. At the age of 21 he was gazetted to the 1st Royal Dragoons, was promoted captain in 1894, and in 1898 married Lady Anne Coventry. He was for two years hon. A.D.C. to Lieut.-General Ross commanding at Halifax, Nova Scotia, and was a famous game-shot.

— **Sir Lumley Smith**, who was in his 85th year, was educated at University College, London, and at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, where in 1857 he was Ninth Wrangler, and the next year won the Le Bas prize. He was called to the Bar by the Inner Temple in 1860, and took silk twenty years later. In 1892 he was appointed Judge of the Shore-ditch and Bow County Courts, and from there went first to the Westminster County Court, and in 1901 was made a Judge of the City of London Court. Here he distinguished himself greatly, accomplishing much arduous work with great speed combined with judicial soundness. He retired in 1913, and was knighted in 1914. Sir Lumley Smith edited "Mayne on Damages," a classical legal work. He married, in 1874, Jessie, daughter of Sir Thomas Gabriel, Bart.

— **Robert Farquharson, M.D., LL.D.**, who was in his 82nd year, was born in Edinburgh and graduated there in 1858. After holding various medical appointments in London and elsewhere, including that of medical officer of Rugby School, in 1880 he became Liberal Member of Parliament for West Aberdeenshire, which constituency he represented for twenty-five years. He was for six years Chairman of the Private Bill Committee in the House of Commons, and Chairman of the Scottish Liberal Party in his last session. On retiring from Parliament he was made a Privy Councillor. Dr. Farquharson published various medical works and two other volumes, "In and Out of Parliament" and "The House of Commons from Within."

10. **William Edward Parsons, fifth Earl of Rosse**, was in his 45th year. He was educated at Eton and Christ Church, Oxford, and joined the Coldstream Guards. He was later transferred to the Irish Guards, and

fought in the South African War, receiving the Queen's medal with three clasps. Lord Rosse succeeded his father in 1908, and at the outbreak of the European War rejoined the Irish Guards. He was severely wounded in the head in 1915 and never really recovered his health. He married, in 1905, Miss Frances Lois Lister-Kaye, a grand-daughter of the sixth Duke of Newcastle, and was succeeded by his son, Lord Oxmantown, who was born in 1906.

10. **Senator Arrigo Boito**, Chevalier of the Legion of Honour, the great Italian composer and poet, was born at Padua in 1842. His father was an Italian painter, and his mother was a Pole. Quite early in life he became a classical scholar, and he also wrote articles in both French and Italian, and studied music at the Conservatoire at Milan; but in this art he made little progress as a student. During the war with Austria he served as a volunteer under Garibaldi, and in 1867 settled in Paris as a journalist. In 1868, however, he finished an opera begun years before dealing with the "Faust" legend, and it was produced at the Scala, Milan, under the title of "Mefistofele." The opera was of great length, and was eventually cut down, but it had considerable success. Boito's chief work for music was accomplished as Inspector-General of Technical Instruction in Italian conservatori, and as a writer of operatic libretti. In the latter pursuit he was probably influenced by Wagner, whose music he did much to introduce into Italy. As a poet he belonged to the Romantic school, and while his work shows the influence of Emilio Praga, it is in the main markedly original. He published in 1877 a volume of poems, which, among many short works, contained "Re Orso," an extraordinary fantasy, which exhibited its author's love for the uncanny, and, at the same time, his exquisite lyrical gift. Boito received many honours in his own country, and in 1893 he was made an honorary Mus.D. of the University of Cambridge.

11. **Brigadier-General Wellesley L. H. Paget, C.B., C.M.G., M.V.O.**, was born in 1858, and was educated at Winchester and Woolwich. He commanded the 2nd Brigade Division, R.F.A., in South Africa in 1900, and received the Queen's medal with six clasps, and he also served with distinction in the European War during 1914-16.

13. The Rev. Dr. James Drummond, who was one of the great Unitarian leaders of his day, was born in Dublin in 1835, and was the son of a minister. Educated at Trinity College, Dublin, he graduated in 1855, winning the First Classical Gold Medal. He then spent three years studying for the ministry at Manchester New College, London, and then became assistant at Cross Street Chapel, Manchester, to the Rev. W. Gaskell, husband of the well-known novelist. In 1869 Drummond was appointed Professor of Biblical and Historical Theology at Manchester College, and he held this post until in 1885 he was called upon to succeed Dr. James Martineau as Principal. In 1889 the College was removed to Oxford, and Dr. Drummond continued to be its head until in 1906 he retired into private life. Dr. Drummond's published sermons reveal him as a man of great spiritual fervour, but his lectures were his great life-work. These, subsequently embodied in book form, are monuments of patient scholarship, showing remarkable thoroughness and an acute and impartial critical faculty. His Commentaries on Jewish History,

on the Epistles of St. Paul, and on the Fourth Gospel are recognised as works of great weight and authority. Dr. Drummond also wrote the "Life and Letters of F. James Martineau."

16. Mrs. Mary Benson, the widow of Archbishop Benson, was the daughter of the Rev. Henry Sidgwick. She married her cousin, who was then Head Master of Wellington, in 1859, when she was only eighteen, and her influence over his life was extraordinarily deep. She was an extremely gifted woman, with a great sense of humour, combined with a faculty of sympathy, which made her much loved by her family and friends.

22. Professor Henry George Plimmer, F.R.S., F.L.S., F.R.M.S., who was 61 years of age, was educated at Guy's Hospital. He was Professor of Comparative Pathology at the Imperial College of Science and Technology, London, and a lecturer at St. Mary's Hospital, Paddington. He contributed articles to "Nature" and the "Lancet."

JULY.

3. David Alfred Thomas, first Viscount Rhondda, was born in 1856. His father was a grocer at Merthyr, who after making a considerable success at his trade began to speculate in coal. To this business he introduced his son after the latter's education at a private school at Clifton and at Caius College, Cambridge. The development of the coal industry in Wales did not absorb all the young man's energies; he became an enthusiastic supporter of Liberal politics, and in 1888 he was elected to represent Merthyr Boroughs in the House of Commons. He retained his seat for twenty-two years, and in 1910 stood for Cardiff. However, he resigned that seat during the course of the same year, feeling that his vast business undertakings required his full attention. Mr. Thomas came to the fore in the early 'nineties in an attempt to reconcile the differences between the Welsh coalowners and miners. The miners complained that their wages varied with the selling price of coal, and Mr. Thomas, as their champion, suggested a scheme for controlling output in such a way as to avoid extreme fluctuations in prices. He was much esteemed by the

miners, and during the great strike of 1898, at the Clydach Vale Collieries, of which he was a director, work was still carried on. In 1910-12, however, Mr. Thomas stood firmly by the Coalowners Association in demanding a proper observance of contracts. In 1916 he took office in Mr. Lloyd George's Ministry, and this necessitated his withdrawal from about forty directorships. In 1913 he had organised the supercombine of Consolidated Cambrian (Limited), which controls South Welsh coal mines. He was chairman of this, and was associated with numerous other important companies. In 1914 Mr. Thomas assumed with great energy the task of "capturing German trade." He helped in the re-creation under British management of some of the German-run businesses which the war had brought under Government control. He went to America to complete various important war contracts on behalf of the British Government, and returned home on the *Lusitania* when that ship was torpedoed in 1915. Mr. Thomas was in the United States and in Canada again in the course of the same year, for the purpose of expediting the output of munitions for Great Britain, and to regulate the

prices charged to the Government. In this mission he was highly successful, and on January 1, 1916, he was granted a barony. When Mr. Lloyd George was called upon to form a Ministry, Lord Rhondda was appointed President of the Local Government Board, and in June, 1917, he became Food Controller. The first part of his administration was marked by the securing by the Government of the control over supplies of necessities, and by the consequent price-fixing, which helped to relieve the public from the machinations of food profiteers. Then followed the rationing of certain foods; and in spite of inevitable criticisms, especially on the part of the farmers, Lord Rhondda's heavy task was almost universally admitted to have been conspicuously well performed. He received the honour of a viscounty in June, 1917, with special remainder to his daughter Lady Mackworth, who was the only child of his marriage with a cousin of Sir Douglas Haig.

3. Mohamed V., Sultan of Turkey, was born in 1844, and was the younger brother of Abdul Hamid, on whose deposition in 1909 he was raised to the Throne by the revolutionaries. He was a student and a mystic by nature, and until he became Sultan had taken no interest in politics. He was a retiring and good-natured man, but even so his life was rendered uncomfortable and somewhat insecure by his brother's jealousy of him. He was often a prisoner in his own palace for months at a time, and could not gain that acquaintance with men and matters which might have fitted him for his subsequent position. Consequently, though he was opposed to despotism, and anxious to do well by his country, he had little or no influence. The "Young Turks" who had placed him in power prevented any but their own followers from having access to him. He visited Brusa in 1909 and Macedonia in 1911 and was liked by those populations, but when the Italian War broke out and the methods of the Committee of Union and Progress increased in harshness, the Sultan shared in the unpopularity. Said Pasha's Cabinet fell in July, 1912, and for a time the monarch had more freedom of action, but the disastrous Balkan War and the resumption of power by the Committee in 1913 changed his position for the worse. He was a friend to Great Britain and was believed to have done his best to prevent the rupture of 1914, but by

that time he had become a puppet in the hands of Enver and of Talaat Bey.

5. General Sir, William Campbell, K.C.B., who was 71 years of age, served with distinction in the Ashanti War, 1878-74, and in Egypt in 1882 when he was mentioned in dispatches and received the Khedive's Star. He was A.D.C. to Queen Victoria, 1893-1901, and to King Edward VII., 1901-4. He was Provincial Grand Master of Freemasonry in Worcestershire.

7. Sir Clive Oldnall Long Philipps-Wolley, F.R.G.S., who died in British Columbia, was born in 1854. He was at one time British Vice-Consul at Kertch, and subsequently went as an explorer to the Caucasus. He contributed several volumes to literature, dealing with sport and big game, and was knighted in 1914. He married a daughter of Rear-Admiral Fenwick.

8. The Hon. Lady Cunningham, who was 73 years of age, was the second daughter of the first Lord Lawrence, whose constant companion she was, both during the period of his Viceroyalty of India from 1864 to 1869, and also when on his return to England he became the Chairman of the first London School Board, when she acted as his secretary. She married Sir Henry Cunningham, K.C.I.E., in 1877, and spent ten years with him in India, when he held the appointment of Judge of the High Court of Calcutta. Lady Cunningham greatly resembled her father in appearance and manners, and her steadfast and reliable character gained her many friends.

9. Frank Craig, who was a well-known painter and magazine artist, was born in 1874, and received his education at the Lambeth School of Art, and the Royal Academy Schools. He was a medallist of the Paris Salon, and a member of the National Portrait Gallery, and there are specimens of his work in the Tate Gallery and the National Collection in Paris. He contributed illustrations to the *Graphic* and various monthlies.

10. James Sutherland Cotton was born in 1847 at Coonor, Madras, and was the son of Joseph John Cotton of the Madras Civil Service. He was educated principally at Winchester and Oxford, where he was a Scholar of Trinity College, and Secretary of the Union Society. In 1870 he took a First Class in Classical Moderations

and also in Lit. Hum., and from 1871 to 1874 was a Fellow and Lecturer of Queen's College. Mr. Cotton was called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn in 1874 and in 1881 became editor of the *Academy*, which was then a critical and highly scholarly journal. In the fifteen years during which he guided its destinies, it achieved a great repute in cultivated circles. Mr. Cotton was for many years the assistant of the late Sir William Hunter in his literary works on Indian life and history, and he helped to compile the first general Gazetteer of India in 1881, and to bring out its expanded second edition four years later. Later he catalogued the European MSS. relating to India in the library of the India Office. Mr. Cotton was a man of retiring nature whose great erudition was not always recognised. He married, in 1873, Miss Isabella Carter of Clifton, Bristol.

11. William John Lydston Poulett, seventh Earl Poulett, was born in 1838, and was the son of the sixth Earl by his marriage with Rosa, daughter of Alfred Hugh de Melville. He was educated at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and was at one time a lieutenant in the Highland Light Infantry, and later a captain in the Warwickshire R.H.A. (T.). He saw three years' service in France, and owing to ill-health was transferred latterly to home service. Lord Poulett succeeded his father in 1899, and was obliged to establish his right to the earldom in 1903, when an organ-grinder claimant contested it with him. Lord Poulett married, in 1908, Sylvia Lilian, daughter of the actor, Fred Storey, and was succeeded by his son, Viscount Hinton.

12. Lord Parker of Waddington was in his 62nd year, and was the son of the Rev. R. Parker, Vicar of Claxby, Lincolnshire. He held scholarships at Westminster and Eton; and went on to King's College, Cambridge, where, in 1880, he was bracketed fourth in the First Class of the Classical Tripos. In 1881 he became a Fellow of his College, and two years later was called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn. Parker had read Law with Mr. Ingle Joyce, and for some years he occupied a room in the latter's chambers, assisting his former tutor, and himself becoming acquainted with a number of influential people. When Mr. Joyce was appointed Junior Counsel to the Treasury on the Equity side in 1886, Parker continued to build up a large practice, and became increasingly identified with Government work, and in the year 1900 when Mr. Joyce

was raised to the Bench he succeeded him as "Attorney-General's Devil." He occupied this position until, in 1906, he himself became a Judge. At this time Parker was little known outside the profession, among the members of which he had a high reputation as a sound and painstaking lawyer; but as a Judge he showed ability which amounted to genius. So highly was he rated that, in 1913, Mr. Asquith appointed him over the heads of the five Lords Justices to be a Lord of Appeal-in-Ordinary in place of Lord Macnaghten, who had died in office. The new life-peer took the title of Lord Parker of Waddington, and though after the first year he was much distressed by ill-health, partly consequent on eye trouble, he fought bravely against it, and his great intellectual powers showed no diminution. He attended to his duties up to a short time before his death, presiding in the Second Division of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, constituted in 1916 to deal with appeals from the Prize Court. On March 19, 1916, he propounded in the House of Lords a remarkably practical scheme for a League of Nations. Lord Parker married, in 1884, Constance, daughter of Mr. Trevor Barkly, and left three sons and two daughters.

13. Douglas Graham Campbell, C.M.G., who was 50 years of age, went in 1883 from Ceylon to Malaya as a surveyor in the Public Works Department, and in 1885 was appointed a land officer in the Selangor Civil Service. Here he showed much interest in the development of the land system, and in 1904 was appointed British Resident in the Negri Sembilan. For the next six years he gained much diplomatic experience in his dealings with various Sultans, and in 1910 Sir John Anderson, then Governor of the Straits Settlements, appointed him to the newly-created post of General Adviser to the Sultan of Johore. He much improved the financial position of this State, and introduced many reforms, among others the land system of Sir Richard Torrens. In 1912 Mr. Campbell received the C.M.G. He was twice married, and left two daughters.

14. Colonel James Charles Cavenish was in his 80th year. He was the son of the late Lord George Cavenish, and a second cousin of the Duke of Devonshire. He served in the Crimea, retiring from the army in 1867 with the rank of captain. He was prominent in the public affairs of

Derbyshire, a deputy-lieutenant of the county, and honorary colonel of the 2nd Battalion of the old Derbyshire volunteers. He was also appointed, in 1891, A.D.C. to Queen Victoria.

15. **Lionel Percy Smythe, R.W.S., R.A.**, was born in 1840. His best-known works are in water-colours, in which he attained a high artistic level. He was elected A.R.A. in 1898 and R.A. in 1911. His painting "Germinal" is in the Chantrey Collection.

16. **Edward Compton**, who was born in 1854, was a member of a well-known theatrical family, being the son of Henry Compton (Mackenzie) and a brother of Miss (Kate) Compton. He began his stage career at an early age, acting first in the provinces, and becoming highly esteemed as a comedian in London in the 'eighties, when he played among other classical parts those of "Malvolio" and "Tony Lumpkin." As a manager he produced several noteworthy new plays, including "The American" by Henry James. Mr. Compton married the accomplished actress Miss Virginia Bateman, and two of their children, Mr. Compton Mackenzie and Miss Fay Compton, have had success on the stage and in the literary world.

— **Nicholas II., ex-Tsar of Russia**, who was shot by Bolsheviks, was born in 1868, and was the son of Alexander III. (then heir-apparent to the Throne) and Princess Dagmar of Denmark. His education was in part directed by an English tutor, and he spoke English, French, and German perfectly, and travelled widely in the East. He succeeded his father in 1894, his marriage to Princess Alix of Hesse taking place the same year. The young Emperor had inherited the autocratic notions of government held by his father, for whom he had a deep veneration, and he now propounded these views to his subjects. At the same time he was essentially a peace-loving man, and the Hague Conference originated from his proposal to diminish the burden of increasing armaments by international consent.

The war with Japan, however, brought Russia upon evil days. Great want of foresight was shown both by the Tsar and his advisers at the outset, and the direct outcome of this was the series of military disasters which caused Russian prestige to suffer grievously, especially in the East. The Emperor's weakness of character also became ap-

parent as the revolutionary elements in his country gained in force, and his lack of decision at the political crisis in 1904, when he appeared alternately as an autocrat and as inclined to accede to the demands of the Liberals, made a very unfavourable impression. The sudden cessation of hostilities on terms much more agreeable to Russia than was expected, made the situation appear more hopeful, and in October, 1905, an Imperial manifesto granting assent to many of the Liberal proposals was published. These included the creation of a State Duma, containing representatives of the unenfranchised classes, and also freedom of speech and liberty of conscience for all the Tsar's subjects. But nothing could appease the extremists, and insurrections broke out which had to be suppressed by military force.

The Imperial Duma held its first sitting in May, 1906, and though it and its immediate successor were wrecked owing to the implacable hostility to the Government shown by the Socialist factions, the third Duma proved more tractable, and from November, 1907, onwards the constitutional experiment seemed to be succeeding. The regrettable death by assassination of the Premier, M. Stolypin, in 1911, was followed by the appointment of M. Kokovtsov as his successor, and when the Great War broke out in 1914 the Tsar took a strong line. He led the national movement of resistance to German aggression, and with considerable courage ordered the closing of nearly all the liquor shops—a measure which had a marvellous success. But the Army was unprepared for war on such a vast scale, and against such power as was wielded by the Central Empires. Incompetence, and in some cases traitorous dealings with the enemy, were revealed in high places. The circulation of rumours that the Empress was in secret consultation with Kaiser Wilhelm (the admitted representative of autocracy) with a view to concluding a separate peace fanned the revolutionary flame. The food question, especially in Petrograd, became acute, and in March, 1917, the Tsar lost his throne, and became a prisoner in the hands of his embittered subjects.

The chief defects in the character of Nicholas II. were undoubtedly weakness and want of foresight. He was an amiable and in many ways a well-meaning man, courteous to those with whom he came in contact, and personally gracious to the humblest of his people. But the task laid upon him

was one too great for his moderate abilities, and his end, a lamentable and pathetic one, might almost have been predicted.

17. **Ilya Efimovitch Repin**, the great Russian painter, was in his 80th year. His parentage was humble and he educated himself by his own efforts. His portraits and historical paintings brought him renown, and he was the friend of Tolstoy. He rejoiced in the revolution in Russia, but his end was a tragic commentary on the prevailing state of things, as he died from starvation at his home in Finland, just beyond the borders of his native country.

18. **Lady Fisher**, wife of Admiral of the Fleet, Lord Fisher, was the only daughter of the late Rev. T. D. Broughton, Rector of Bletchley. She was married to Lord Fisher in 1866 and left a son and three daughters. Lady Fisher was well known as a charming hostess.

20. **William Randal McDonnell**, eleventh Earl of Antrim, was born in 1851, and succeeded his father in 1869. He was educated at Eton and Oxford, and was well known as a stock raiser and a keen agriculturist. In 1875 he married Louisa Jane, daughter of the late General the Hon. Charles Grey, and sister of the fourth Earl Grey. He was succeeded by his son, Viscount Dunluce.

21. **Miss Florence Haydon**, who was 80 years of age, had a stage career of over half a century. She played leading parts at the Haymarket in the 'sixties, and for many years acted and taught acting in London. Her greatest triumphs were achieved at the Court Theatre under the Vedrenne-Barker management when she was no longer young, and her best rôle was that of the stupid, kind-hearted woman which she played to perfection.

27. **Major F. Bennett-Goldney**, F.S.A., M.P., who was about 58 years of age, died at Brest as the result of a motor-car accident. He was Mayor of Canterbury from 1906 to 1911, and represented that city as a Unionist in the House of Commons from 1910 until his death. He spoke very freely on the German peril nine years before the war, and when it broke out he gave much time and service to Hospitals in Kent and to the cause of the refugees arriving at Folkestone. In October, 1917, Major Bennett-Goldney was appointed to a position at the British Embassy in Paris, and a few months later was gazetted Honorary Assistant Military Attaché.

— **Sir Jonathan Edmund Backhouse, Bart., D.L., J.P.**, director of Barclay & Co., bankers, was born in 1849, and was educated at Rugby and Trinity Hall, Cambridge. He was for many years President of the Darlington Liberal-Unionist Association. He was succeeded by his son, Mr. E. T. Backhouse, who was born in 1873.

28. **Frederick T. Roberts, M.D., F.R.C.P., B.Sc. (Lond.), Hon. D.Sc. (Wales)**, was a Fellow of University College, London, and Emeritus-Professor of Medicine and Clinical Medicine at the College, where he had also received his education. He published various medical works and was formerly assistant editor of Quain's "Dictionary of Medicine." Dr. Roberts was in his 79th year.

— **Sir John Wilson, Bart.**, was Liberal-Unionist M.P. for Falkirk Burghs from 1895 to 1906. He was Chairman of the Wilson & Clyde Coal Company, and owned mineral estates in Lanarkshire and Fifeshire. He was succeeded by his son, Mr. J. R. Wilson, who was born in 1883.

AUGUST.

1. **Lieut.-General Sir Henry Le Guay Geary, K.C.B.**, was born in 1837, and served with distinction with the Royal Artillery in the Crimea, for which he received the medal with clasn, the 5th class of the Medjidieh, and the Turkish medal. He also served in India during the latter part of the Mutiny. In 1862 he became Captain, and subsequently held the appointment of Brigade-Major to

the Artillery with Lord Napier of Magdala in Abyssinia. For his services in this campaign he received the medal, and was promoted Major by brevet. He became a Colonel in 1881, and a Major-General in 1891, and in succession commanded the Belfast District, was President of the Ordnance Committee, and from 1902 to 1904 was Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Bermuda. His last appointment was

that of Colonel-Commandant of the Royal Artillery. In 1865 he married Sophia Mary, daughter of George Symes of Bridport, and had a family of one son and three daughters.

1. Lieut.-Colonel E. Gunter was born in 1841, and was gazetted to the 59th Foot in 1858. He served at the Cape, in Ceylon, in India, and in the second Afghan War, and subsequently became D.A.A.G. for instruction in the South-Eastern District and in Canada. He wrote various well-known books on military law and tactics.

2. Professor Richard Norton was Director of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome from 1899 to 1907. In 1910 he was Director of the American Expedition to Cyrene. When the European War broke out he organised the American Volunteer Ambulance Corps, and later on was attached to the United States Naval Mission in Paris, where he died. Mr. Norton was a member of a New England family, and brought a strong spirit of adventure to the pursuit of an archaeological and academic career. He was also possessed of artistic faculties of a high order, and a brilliant wit. He received the Croix de Guerre and the British Mons Medal for his conspicuous devotion to duty under severe shell fire, and was also admitted to the Legion of Honour.

6. Thomas Algernon Dorrien-Smith, J.P., D.L., was Lord Proprietor of the Scilly Islands, and was in his 73rd year. He was the son of the late Colonel R. A. Smith-Dorrien and was educated at Harrow. From 1864 to 1874 he served in the 10th Hussars, and later in the Herts Yeomanry. In 1872 he succeeded his uncle, Augustus Smith, and married, in 1875, Edith, daughter of Christopher Tower and Lady Sophia Cust. He assumed the name of Smith by Royal licence. His son, Captain A. A. Dorrien-Smith, D.S.O., succeeded him.

8. Sir Walter Armstrong was born in 1850, and was educated at Harrow and Exeter College, Oxford. He was at one time art critic to several newspapers and a famous adviser to collectors of pictures. In particular he was an authority on Dutch seventeenth century and English eighteenth century painting. He was appointed Director of the National Gallery of Ireland in 1892, and he held that post

for over twenty years, receiving the honour of knighthood in 1899. Sir Walter was the author of many books on painters and painting, the best known of these being volumes on Reynolds, Gainsborough, and Velasquez. He married Miss Ferard of Ascot Place in 1878.

9. Asher Wertheimer, the famous art-dealer of New Bond Street, was 74 years of age. He was the son of a German Jew who was led to seek refuge from religious persecution in England. Mr. Wertheimer, after being educated in London and Paris, took his place in his father's art galleries in Bond Street. He made many journeys to the Continent for the purpose of collecting art treasures, and on the death of his father he assumed control of the business. He bought largely at Christie's, and also from private collectors. Two of his most famous "deals" were the purchase of the Hope family's collection of Dutch and Flemish pictures in 1898, and, in connexion with M. J. Seligmann of Paris, some years later he acquired the historic Chêrônèteff collection of old Sèvres porcelain, which was exhibited in Bond Street.

11. John Morgan Richards, who was in his 78th year, was one of the oldest American residents in London (where he settled in business in 1867), and was the father of John Oliver Hobbes, the novelist. In 1877 he was the means of introducing the cigarette into popular use in England. His assistance was often sought by his fellow-countrymen when they desired to extend their business activities in Great Britain, and he did much to promote commercial relations between the two countries. Mr. Richards published a volume of personal reminiscences "With John Bull and Jonathan."

— **The Comte de Pretroode de Calesberg** was in his 79th year. He was an ancient Senator of Belgium, and had been Belgian Ambassador Extraordinary to several European Courts. He came to England from Brussels at the beginning of the war, and died at Reading.

12. William Henry Hudson was born in London in 1862, and after being educated privately was for some time a journalist. He was also Private Secretary for several years to Herbert Spencer. He subsequently held professorships in America, and latterly

was Staff Lecturer in Literature to the Extension Board of London University. He published many books on philosophical and literary subjects.

15. Henry Luttrell Moysey, I.S.O., was born in 1849, and was educated at Cheltenham College. He entered the Ceylon Civil Service in 1870, and in 1906 became Postmaster-General and Director of Telegraphs. He held a position of great influence in the country and worked strenuously for the welfare of the natives. He married Miss O'Grady in 1875.

18. Mrs. Alhusen, poet and author, was the daughter of the late Colonel Butt, 79th Highlanders, and was married to Mr. W. H. Alhusen in 1876. When only 19 years of age she published her popular novel "Miss Molly," and this was followed by many others, notably "Ingelheim," and shorter stories, showing great powers of character delineation, and an artistic touch of great delicacy and finish. A later book of verses, "April Moods," revealed her also as a poet, and she published short poems on the war.

— **John Ebenezer Sutherland, M.P.**, sat in the House of Commons as Liberal Member for the Elgin Burghs from 1905 until his death. He was prominent in local public affairs and was Chairman of the Scottish Temperance and Social Reform Association.

20. Joseph Kidd, M.D., was in his 95th year. He qualified in 1846 and took his degree at Aberdeen in 1853. Though an Irishman he came to London early in life, and was a well-known homœopathic practitioner. He had many distinguished patients, among whom were Lord Beaconsfield and Mr. John Bright, and he was held in high esteem as a physician and a large-hearted and charitable man by a wide circle of patients and friends. Dr. Kidd was twice married, and had fifteen children, of whom twelve survived him.

— **Engineer Rear - Admiral Francis Henry Lister** was 56 years of age. He entered the service as an engineer student in 1879, and from 1889 to 1891 served successively on the *Conqueror*, the *Serapis*, and at the Admiralty. After a period of service on the North America and West Indies Station he was appointed in 1896 Instructor in Engine Design at the Royal Naval College, Greenwich, where he

remained for three years, and from 1905 to 1910 was Inspector in the department of Engineer-in-Chief of the Fleet. After some further service at sea he held various land appointments in connexion with the Admiralty, and in May, 1917, was made Engineer Captain on the Staff of the Commander-in-Chief, North America and West Indies Station, and the following October was promoted Rear-Admiral. Soon after this he was appointed to the Staff of the Coast of Ireland Command. He died suddenly at Queenstown, and left a widow and three children.

24. The Rev. Llewellyn Bevan, D.D., was 76 years of age. He was a well-known Congregational minister in London as a young man, and in 1886 went to Melbourne as pastor of Collins Street Church. He was subsequently made Principal of Parkin College, Adelaide, and latterly, in spite of his advanced age, insisted on serving as an Army Chaplain.

26. The Rev. Arthur Evans Moule, D.D., formerly Archdeacon in mid-China, was 82 years of age. He was one of the several distinguished sons of the late Rev. H. Moule, Vicar of Fordington, Dorset, and was educated by his father, until he went to a college in Malta, and from there to the Church Missionary College at Islington. He was possessed by an ardent missionary spirit, and in 1861 joined the Chekiang Mission, arriving in Ningpo when the T'ai-P'ing Rebellion was in progress. Mr. Moule published his recollections of these events some years later. His connexion with the Church Missionary Society lasted until 1896, and during this period he worked at Hangchow and Shanghai as well as at Ningpo. From 1896 until 1902 he held benefices in England, but his health then allowed him to return to China where he resumed his work until, in 1908, he accepted the living of Burwarton, Shropshire.

Dr. Moule's contributions to missionary literature, both in Chinese and in English, were numerous. He was a devoted evangelist, and was much loved in China. As a scholar his work was recognised by Archbishops Tait and Davidson, of Canterbury, who respectively conferred upon him the degrees of B.D. in 1881 and D.D. in 1912. Dr. Moule married, in 1861, Eliza Agnes, a daughter of the Rev. J. Bernan, a missionary in British Guiana, and he left a family, several of whom were engaged in missionary work in the East.

28. **Professor Robert Saundby, M.D., F.R.C.P., LL.D.**, was born in 1849, and as a young man went to the East as a tea-planter. Ill-health caused him to return to England, where he studied medicine at Edinburgh, and graduated in 1874. In 1876 he went to Birmingham, and there held posts at the General Hospital, being appointed Physician in 1885, a post which he held for twenty-seven years. In 1911-12 he was President of the British Medical Association, and for many years he held the Professorship of Medicine in Birmingham University. He was also a founder and editor of the *Birmingham Medical Review*. He married Miss Spencer, of Wolverhampton, in 1880, and had five children.

28. **Arthur Playfair**, the actor, was born in India in 1869, and was the son of a distinguished soldier, Major-General Playfair. He was educated at Edgbaston, and at the Oxford Military College, but went on the stage at seventeen years of age. He came to London in 1887, and then toured with Mr. and Mrs. Kendal, being afterwards engaged by Mr. Charles Hawtrey, with whom he played, as the butler, in "The Man from Blankleys," a part in which he scored a great success. He was one of the first London comedians to appear in "revue." His first wife was Miss Lena Ashwell, by whom he was divorced.

SEPTEMBER.

3. **Lord Forrest**, the first Australian to be created a peer, was born in 1847. He was educated at Perth, Western Australia, and became a surveyor. In 1883 he was appointed Surveyor-General of his State, and as the holder of this position sat on the Legislative Council, and was a member of the Executive Council under Crown Colony Government. In 1890, when Western Australia was granted responsible government, Forrest was made the first Premier. In 1891 he was made K.C.M.G., and he showed great energy and keenness as a statesman during his ten years in office as Premier. In 1901 Forrest became Postmaster-General in the first Commonwealth Government, and he held office in six of the thirteen Commonwealth Cabinets of his time. He was Treasurer in the "National" Cabinet formed by Mr. Hughes in the spring of 1917, and resigned in February, 1918, owing to ill-health. He was then created a Baron of the United Kingdom, and was on his way to England to take his seat in the House of Lords when he died at sea. In 1876 Lord Forrest married Miss Margaret Hamersby. He was a popular man in Western Australia, and that State owes much to his ardour for its development.

— **Margaret Todd, M.D.**, was born in 1859, and was educated at Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Berlin. She was first engaged in teaching, and subsequently studied at the Edinburgh School of Medicine for Women, where she took her degrees in 1894. She became assistant medical officer at the

Edinburgh Hospital and Dispensary for Women and Children. Dr. Todd wrote, under the name of Graham Travers, several novels, and, under her own name, published the life of Dr. Jex Blake.

4. **William Hart Bennett, C.M.G.**, Governor of British Honduras, was born in 1861, and entered the Colonial Service in 1878. From 1884 to 1900 he was Chief Clerk in the Chief Secretary's office at Cyprus, and then became Colonial Secretary of the Falklands. In 1905 he was made Colonial Secretary of the Bahamas, and from there was appointed to British Honduras.

5. **Sir Ratan Tata** was 47 years of age, and was the son of the late Mr. Jamsetjee N. Tata, of Bombay, who was a great pioneer of the industrial development of India. Sir Ratan was educated at St. Xavier's College, Bombay, and on the death of his father in 1904, he and his brother proceeded to devote the large fortune which they inherited to the furtherance of its creator's schemes for the benefit of his country. An Indian Institute of Research was established at Mysore, where scientific, medical, and philosophical studies were to be pursued. Great iron and steel works were founded at Sakchi and attained a remarkable success, proving notably useful to India during the Great War. Mr. Tata, senior, had also had visions of the storing and utilisation of the rainfall of the Western Ghats for the development of electrical power for the City of Bombay. This scheme, too,

was carried out by his sons at an enormous cost, and Bombay was supplied with an immense quantity of electrical power by the Tata Hydro-Electrical Works. Sir Ratan Tata lived for considerable periods in England at York House, Twickenham. His philanthropy was very great and practical. He founded the Ratan Tata Department of Social Science and Administration in the London School of Economics, and in 1912 established the "Ratan Tata Fund" in connexion with the University of London. The object of this was to provide, during a certain number of years, 1,400*l.* per annum "to promote the study and further the knowledge of the principles and methods of preventing and relieving destitution and poverty." Sir Ratan was knighted in 1916. His wife, whom he married in 1892, was Miss Naja Sett, a member of the family of the head of the priestly caste of the Parsi community.

5. Raymond Robert Tyrwhitt-Wilson, eighth Baron Berners, was 63 years of age. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, and succeeded his father as fourth baronet in 1894. In 1917, on the death of his mother, he succeeded as eighth baron. In 1910 he was High Sheriff of Shropshire, and was attached latterly as a second lieutenant to the Inland Water Transport. Lord Berners was unmarried, and his nephew, Gerald Hugh Tyrwhitt, born in 1883, succeeded to both titles.

7. Frederick William Hayes, the landscape painter and novelist, was in his 71st year. He was one of the founders of the Liverpool Water-Colour Society. He exhibited at the Royal Academy for many years, his earlier work being coast and mountain subjects. He also produced a great number of black-and-white drawings, and illustrated his own historical novels, among which "The Shadow of a Throne" may be mentioned. He was keenly interested in social reform, and worked for the Fabian Society, and, during the war, at the Ministry of Munitions.

8. William Henry James Boot was Vice-president of the Royal Society of British Artists from 1895 to 1914. From 1874 to 1884 he exhibited regularly at the Royal Academy, and later and occasionally at other important exhibitions, and was for twenty years from its foundation art editor of the *Strand Magazine*. He contributed

drawings to many other well-known periodicals.

9. Sophia Harriet, Lady Ravensworth was the daughter of Sir Thomas Waller, Bart., of the Diplomatic Service. She married in 1866, and from the time of her husband's succession to the title in 1904 she took a leading part in religious and philanthropic work in the neighbourhood of Gateshead. She was particularly interested in child welfare.

11. Lord Robson of Jesmond was born in 1852 at Newcastle-on-Tyne, and was educated at Caius College, Cambridge, where he took a second class in the Moral Sciences Tripos in 1877. In 1880 he was called to the Bar by the Inner Temple, and joining the North-Eastern Circuit practised successfully as a junior. In 1885-86 he was Liberal member for Bow and Bromley, and in 1892 he took silk. As an advocate he was both vigorous and tenacious of the points of his argument, but his winning manner made him popular in the profession. The most important event of his career at the Bar was his defence of Lord Russell who was tried by his peers for bigamy committed in the United States. In 1905 Mr. Robson was appointed Solicitor-General. He had then been member for South Shields for ten years, and had identified himself with the advanced section of the Liberal party. In 1908 Sir William Robson (as he then was) became Attorney-General. He only held that post until 1910, but during that time he distinguished himself by his work in the Atlantic Fisheries Arbitration at the Hague. He was appointed a Lord of Appeal in Ordinary in succession to Lord Collins in 1910, and his hearing of appeals was marked by extreme care and conscientious industry. Lord Robson married Miss Catherine Burg in 1887, and had one son and three daughters.

12. Sir George Houston Reid, M.P., was the son of a Presbyterian minister, and was born in Scotland in 1845. In 1852 his family went to Australia, and in 1858 to Sydney. He entered the State Civil Service in 1864, and in 1875 became an honorary member of the Cobden Club as a result of his publication of "Five Free Trade Essays." Later on he was awarded the Cobden gold medal. He was appointed secretary to the Attorney General in 1878, and in 1879 was admitted to the Bar of New South

Wales. In 1880 he became member of Parliament for East Sydney, and three years later he was appointed Minister of Public Instruction, but he resigned this post in 1884. He married Miss Flora Bromby in 1891, and became leader of the Free Trade Party the same year. In 1894 his party defeated the Dibbs Ministry, and came into power with a very democratic programme. Sir George Reid held office until 1899 when his supporters became dissatisfied with his delay in passing legislation which they thought desirable. They then gave their support to Sir W. Lyne, with the result that it was he and not Sir George Reid to whom the Premiership was offered at the beginning of the Commonwealth. This affected Sir George very deeply. His two most noteworthy achievements in State politics were firstly his establishment of Government high schools and technical schools while he was Minister of Public Instruction, and secondly his action as Premier in appointing a non-political board in which were vested all appointments to and promotions in the Public Service. When the great question of Federation came to the fore, and many statesmen were prepared to sacrifice every minor issue to its cause, Sir George Reid stood out against it. He opposed the Bill of 1891 on the ground that New South Wales could not federate unless she abandoned Free Trade. Later on, however, when Federation was called for by non-political conventions in many country districts, Sir George threw his energies into putting the movement on a basis as democratic as possible, and when the Commonwealth was inaugurated he was leader of an Opposition composed mainly of Free Traders. The second Parliament set aside the Fiscal question, and Sir George combined with the Labour Party to oust Mr. Deakin, and subsequently joined forces with Mr. Deakin against Mr. Watson. The result was that he became at last Prime Minister, but his somewhat heterogeneous party broke up in June, 1905, and after three years more as leader of the Opposition he practically retired from politics. In 1909 he was made a K.C.M.G. and became High Commissioner of the Australian Commonwealth in London. He held this position for six years, and was an efficient and popular administrator. When he retired from the Australian service he received the G.C.B. and became the representative of Hanover Square in the House of Commons.

13. Field-Marshal Lord Nichol-

son, G.C.B., was born in 1845, and was the son of William Nicholson of Roundhay Park, Yorks. In 1865 he joined the Royal Engineers, and he served with distinction in the Afghan War, 1878-80, when he was mentioned in dispatches, was awarded the war medal with three clasps, and the bronze decoration, and was promoted brevet-major. His next campaign was the Egyptian one, where in 1882 he served with the Indian contingent, and in 1886-87 he was A.A.G. at Headquarters in Burma. In 1890 he became military secretary to the Commander-in-Chief in India, and from 1893 held for some years an appointment in the Military Works Department in India. In the Tirah campaign of 1897-98 he was Chief of the Staff to Sir William Lockhart, from whom he received high praise, and his services were rewarded with the K.C.B., and the war medal with two clasps. While he was Adjutant-General in India, Sir William Nicholson was summoned, late in 1899, to South Africa. He was appointed to serve on Lord Roberts' staff, and was first his chief's military secretary, and afterwards Director of Transport. He was awarded the Queen's medal with five clasps, and was promoted Major-General. In 1901 he was made Director-General of Mobilisation and Military Intelligence at the War Office, a post he retained for three years. This was followed by a short period of service as Military Attaché to the Japanese Army in Manchuria. He then became Quartermaster-General to the Forces, and third member of the Army Council, and three years later he was appointed Chief of the General Staff, and first member of the Army Council. In 1908 he was made a G.C.B., and in 1911 he was raised to the rank of Field-Marshal, and in 1910-11 he held the position of A.D.C. to the King. On his retirement in 1912 he was raised to the peerage as Baron Nicholson of Roundhay. In 1871 he married Miss Victorine Dillon, but he left no heir.

13. **Sir Samuel Thomas Evans, G.C.B.**, was born in Wales in 1859. He took a B.A. degree at London University, and was "admitted" as a solicitor in 1889. He practised with considerable success in his native town of Neath, and in 1890 he was elected to represent Mid-Glamorganshire in the Liberal interest in the House of Commons. In 1891 Mr. Evans was called to the Bar. He was then a comparatively poor man with a family depending on him, but he joined the

South Wales Circuit, and his old friends supported him so well that after a year or two he had built up a large practice as a junior. In 1901 he took silk, and this venture also proved successful, and he was the favourite counsel of his fellow-countrymen, being frequently engaged in cases before the House of Lords arising out of Trade Union disputes. In Parliament Mr. Evans was an able exponent of advanced Radical views, and in 1908 Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman appointed him Solicitor-General. In the short period during which he held this post he showed great adaptability to his new surroundings, and in the House of Commons he defended the legislative schemes of the Government with much force. When he was appointed President of the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division, however, his selection for this post was received by the profession with some doubt as to its suitability. The work of the Division was almost entirely new to him, and it was felt that his antecedents hardly fitted him to fill the place previously occupied by Jeune and Gorell Barnes. These prognostications proved not altogether incorrect. The new Judge quickly acquired knowledge of the law of Admiralty and Divorce, but his methods and manners not infrequently gave offence to those who practised before him. The re-establishment of the Prize Court, which was brought about by the war in 1914, gave Sir Samuel Evans a great opportunity of proving his ability, and this he did. Although the work was outside anything in his previous experience, he set himself with great industry to master its intricacies, and to reconcile to modern trade conditions principles laid down a hundred years previously. His judgments stood well the test of being reviewed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and in the "Kim" case his exposition of the doctrine of "continuous transportation" was regarded as almost classical. He was made a G.C.B. in 1917. Sir Samuel Evans was fond of music and society, and was twice married.

16. **Rear-Admiral A. H. W. Battiscombe** was 97 years of age. As a naval cadet he served in 1846 in the operations against Bruni, Burma, and in 1850 was present at the capture of piratical junks in Bias Bay, Cochin China. He received the Baltic medal for his services as lieutenant of the *Corwallis* at the bombardment of Sveaborg.

18. **J. R. Mann, A.M.I.C.E., F.R.S.A.**, who was in his 91st year, was the son of Mr. John Mann who had charge of the London parks and Buckingham Palace Gardens for many years. He was appointed surveyor of works on the Osborne estate, Isle of Wight, in 1856 and retained that position for thirty-five years.

19. **Madame Liza Lehmann** was born in 1862, and studied singing with Randegger and Hamish McCunn. For nine years she sang in public, and was well known as a performer at the Philharmonic and Monday Popular Concerts, at the Crystal Palace, and at musical festivals in the provinces. In 1894 she married Mr. Herbert Bedford, the composer, and retired from the singing profession. Madame Lehmann then devoted herself with great success to composition. Her song-cycles, "In a Persian Garden," "The Daisy Chain," and others are full of interest, as are also her settings of Shakespeare's songs. She also wrote a light opera, "The Vicar of Wakefield," and a musical farce, "Sergeant Brue." As a teacher of singing Madame Lehmann was distinguished by the power she possessed of training her pupils to study the inner meaning of a song, and to render it with the highest degree of intelligence. Musical art is also much indebted to her for her painstaking labours at the British Museum, where she discovered old English songs which she introduced to the modern world.

20. **Mrs. Caroline Amelia Brunswick Longworth-Dames** was in her 98th year. She was a daughter of Thomas Northmore of Cleve, Exeter. Queen Caroline, the wife of George IV., was her godmother, and held her at the font. She became the wife of Captain George Longworth-Dames of the 66th Foot (Royal Berkshire Regiment).

— **Prince Eric of Sweden, Duke of Västmanland**, the third and youngest son of King Gustav, was born in 1889. He died from pneumonia following influenza.

21. **Miss Emily Charlotte Talbot**, of Margam Abbey, Glamorgan, was 78 years of age. She was the eldest daughter and co-heir of Mr. C. R. M. Talbot by his marriage with Lady Charlotte Butler. On the death of her father in 1890 Miss Talbot inherited an immense fortune, the value of which increased largely owing to

her great business capacity. The small village of Port Talbot, round which lay a considerable part of her landed estates, was developed into a large and flourishing town, possessing steel works and docks. Miss Talbot lived very quietly in London and Wales, taking no prominent part in public affairs, but her benevolence and generosity were very great. She was a benefactor on a large scale of the Welsh Church, being joint founder with her sister of St. Michael's Training College for Clergy in the diocese of Llandaff, and also building churches and increasing the stipends of needy clergymen. She also founded a Chair of Preventive Medicine at the Medical School of Cardiff, assisted hospitals, and, during the war, she provided two large Y.M.C.A. huts in Glamorgan and converted Penrice Castle into a hospital for officers. Miss Talbot at one time worked an unremunerative colliery at a loss of nearly 100,000*l.* for the sake of the miners' families.

25. The Right Rev. John Mitchinson, D.D., Master of Pembroke College, Oxford, Canon Residentiary of Gloucester, and formerly Bishop of Barbados, was born in 1833 at Durham. He was the son of a chaplain in the Merchant Service, who died before his birth. The future Bishop was educated at the Grammar School of his native town, and won a scholarship at Pembroke College, Oxford. In 1853 he took a First Class in Classical Moderations, and in 1855 a First Class in Lit. Hum. and in Natural Science. He was elected to a Fellowship at Pembroke College, which he held until 1881, when he became an Honorary Fellow. In 1857 he became Head Master's Assistant at the Merchant Taylors' School. He was ordained to the curacy of St. Philip's, Clerkenwell, in 1858, and from 1859 to 1873 was Head Master of the King's School, Canterbury. In this post he was noted both as a severe disciplinarian, and as a popular and kind-hearted Head. In 1873 he was appointed Bishop of Barbados and the Windward Islands, and in this diocese he found great opportunities for useful work. The climate, however, affected his health, and in 1881 he returned to England, becoming Rector of Sibstone

and assistant Bishop to the great Dr. Magee of Peterborough. His labours in this capacity were so great that he was named the "Toiler of the Sees," and he retained his post until, in 1899, he was appointed to the Mastership of his old College. Here his administration was marked by success, and in Gloucester also, to the Cathedral of which city the Mastership carried a Canonry, he was a prominent figure. Bishop Mitchinson was a keen student of geology (a fossil which he discovered bears his name), a musician, and composer of no small ability, and he was learned on the subject of monastic foundations. The cause of education owes much to him; in particular he was the originator of the Head Masters' Conference. He was a very generous man, on several occasions applying large sums of money for educational purposes. Dr. Mitchinson never married. His sermons were erudite and instructive, and, at the same time, were always delivered with much fervour. He was Select Preacher at Oxford in 1872, 1892, and 1908. He was a representative of the moderate school of Anglicanism.

25. Marmaduke D'Arcy Wyvill, of the ancient family of Wyvill of Constable Burton, and Denton Park, Yorkshire, was in his 70th year. He was Unionist member for the Otley Division of Yorkshire from 1895 to 1900 and was Deputy-Lieutenant for the West Riding. He was twice married and lost his only son in the war.

30. Sir Doyle Money Shaw, K.C.B., R.N., was in his 88th year. He was educated at the Academy and University of Edinburgh, and entered the Navy as Assistant Surgeon in 1854. He served in the Crimea, and was awarded the medal with Sebastopol clasp, and the Turkish medal. While serving in China with a battalion of Marines in 1857-61, he was promoted Staff-Surgeon, and at the bombardment of Alexandria was Senior Medical Officer in H.M.S. *Alexandra*. For this he received the C.B. and was made Deputy Inspector-General. Later he had charge of Naval Hospitals and became Inspector-General of Hospitals and Fleets, retiring in 1892.

OCTOBER.

1. **The Viscount Falmouth, K.C.V.O., C.B.,** was the son of the sixth Viscount and Baroness Le Despencer, and was born in 1847. He was educated at Eton, and in 1866 he joined the Coldstream Guards. He saw service in Egypt in 1882, and in the Nile Expedition of 1884, when he was mentioned in dispatches. He was awarded the M.V.O. in 1897, retired from the Army with the rank of Major-General in 1902, and in 1905 he was made a K.C.V.O. He married the Hon. Kathleen Douglas-Pennant in 1886, and had four sons and one daughter. Two of his sons were killed in the war, and he was succeeded by the eldest, the Hon. Evelyn Boscawen, R.A.F. The son of a father whose name was famous in racing annals Lord Falmouth maintained the family tradition, and his colours were a familiar sight on many a course. In 1902 his filly "Quintessence" won three high-class races, and in 1903 she was the winner of the One Thousand Guineas, and in many subsequent years his horses won races at Newmarket, Ascot, and Epsom.

— **Sir Walter Langley**, who was from 1907 Assistant Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, was a son of the late Mr. Henry Langley. With his duties as a Foreign Office clerk he combined those of private secretary to many distinguished Parliamentary Under-Secretaries and others, including Mr. Lowther, Viscount Grey, Lord Curzon, and Lord Middleton. Sir Walter was for a long period in charge of African and Far Eastern affairs, and was regarded by heads of Departments as an authority on Chinese matters.

2. **Sir David Edward Durell Barclay**, twelfth Baronet, was 60 years of age. He served in Egypt and the Sudan with the 19th Hussars. In 1889 he married Letitia, daughter of the Hon. Amias C. Orde-Powlett. He succeeded his father in 1896. His heir to the title was his brother, Mr. R. C. de B. Barclay.

— **W. L. Boyle, M.P.**, who had represented Mid-Norfolk as a Unionist from 1910, was in his 60th year.

3. **The Rev. Canon Owen Lloyd Williams**, who was Chancellor of Bangor Cathedral from 1908, was in his 90th year. His father was Rector of Aiglesay, and Canon Williams remembered travelling to Oxford in 1851 by

stage coach. He spent his whole ministerial life in the diocese of Bangor, and from 1889 until his death was Rector of Llanrhyddlad. He was known as the "lifeboat parson" among fishermen, as he had always taken a great interest in the provision of lifeboats, of which on several occasions he acted as coxswain, showing great gallantry and saving many lives.

5. **Robert Baldwin Ross** was born in France, at Tours, on May 25, 1869, his father being the Hon. John Ross, Q.C., Attorney-General for Upper Canada, and his mother the daughter of the Hon. Robert Baldwin, the first Premier of Upper Canada under responsible government. He was educated at private schools and at King's College, Cambridge, but he left the university without taking a degree, took to journalism, and soon became one of the foremost writers on art, letters, and the drama. From 1912 to 1914 he was adviser to the Board of Inland Revenue on picture valuations for estate duty, and was also an Additional Trustee of the National Gallery. He will be long remembered for his "brave, loyal, and devoted friendship" to Oscar Wilde, whose literary executor he was and at whose death-bed he was present. He was responsible for the publication of "De Profundis" and of an edition of Wilde's complete works; and through his unceasing efforts the liabilities on Wilde's estate were wiped off and profits were made. Robert Ross had a genius for friendship, and not long before his death his friends had shown their appreciation of his talents, his courage, and his loyalty by making him a presentation of plate and a sum of money, which at his request was devoted to the foundation of a "Robert Ross" scholarship at the Slade School. He had a great reputation as a wit, and he had also considerable learning on many subjects. As a judge of pictures his reputation was very high. For some years past he had filled the position of Art contributor to the **ANNUAL REGISTER**.

— **Major-General Henry Wylie, C.S.I.**, was the son of a Judge in Calcutta, and was born in 1844. He entered the Army in 1861, and served with distinction in the Umbehla Campaign of 1863, in Bhutan in 1865, in Abyssinia in 1868, and in Hazara in the same year. After service in the Afghan War, 1878-80, he became Chief Political Officer in Peshin, and held

various appointments, until in 1898 he was made Agent for Baluchistan to the Governor-General of India. He retired in 1900. Major-General Wylie married twice, and left a widow and three children.

6. Commander F. M. Norman, R.N., was in his 85th year. He was educated at Harrow, and he served with the original Naval Brigade before Sevastopol, and in 1857 in China. He was twice Mayor of Berwick, and established the Berwick Historic Monuments Committee. He published several papers on natural history and archaeology.

7. Sir Charles Hubert Hastings Parry, Bart., C.V.O., Mus. Doc., D.C.L., was born in 1848, and was the son of Mr. Gambier Parry of Highnam Court, near Gloucester. He was educated at Eton and Exeter College, Oxford, where he took the degree of Mus. Bac. at the age of 18. In 1871 he became an underwriter at Lloyd's, but financial losses brought his career there to a close after a few years. He early became associated with Mr. Dannreuther, whose influence upon his artistic career was very great, and at the concerts given at Mr. Dannreuther's house several of Parry's chamber compositions were performed. In 1880 his "Scenes from Prometheus Unbound" was produced at the Gloucester Festival, and his First Symphony at Birmingham in 1882. These works were looked upon by the public, and even by many of the critics of the day, as being over-intellectual and transcendental. But in the years that followed, the multitude of fine choral works that flowed from the composer's pen caused him to be regarded as the exponent of a highly spiritualised passion in musical art, and his "Ode on St. Cecilia's Day," "L'Allegro ed il Penseroso," and "De Profundis" were received by the public with real appreciation. Among musicians Parry's greatness was never for a moment in question. His amazing versatility, shown by comparing such works as his oratorio "Job" (where he dared to add words of his own to the Sacred Text) with his setting of Browning's "Pied Piper," and his part-writing, so masterly that it could be compared with that of Bach, built up a reputation that only increased with years. Parry's genius was his own, and was unique; and whatever position future generations assign to him in the musical revival of his day, it must be one of the highest eminence. From 1894 he was Director of the Royal College of Music,

and was highly esteemed and much loved by all connected with that institution which suffered, in the words of the King, an "irreparable loss" by his death. Sir Hubert was a musical historian of a high order, and his published works on this subject include "The Evolution of the Art of Music," "The Seventeenth Century," and "J. S. Bach." He was Professor of Music in the University of Oxford from 1899 to 1908, was knighted in 1898, and created a baronet in 1908. In 1872 he married Lady Maude Herbert, by whom he had two daughters. As a man Sir Hubert Parry was energetic and genial and possessed a keen sense of humour, with an affectionate disposition which caused him to be known as the most popular man in the musical world. During the war he was chairman of the Music-in-War-time Committee, and gave unsparingly of his time and interest to the assistance of musicians in distress. His funeral at St. Paul's Cathedral was attended by representatives of the King and the Royal Family, of Oxford University, of Eton College, and of all the institutions and societies with which he was connected, as well as by large numbers of the musical profession.

7. William Clacy May, Chief Traffic Manager and Acting General Manager of the Great Eastern Railway, was 49 years of age. From 1886 he had been in the service of the company, being appointed Mineral Manager in 1903, and Chief Goods Manager in 1910.

— **Sir Walter Tapper Jerred, K.C.B.,** was in his 54th year. He entered the Civil Service in the Public Record Office of Ireland in 1882. In 1897 he was transferred to the English Local Government Board where he served until his death, becoming Assistant Secretary in 1910. He was private secretary for some years to Mr. John Burns, and he also acted as Secretary of the Speaker's Conference on Electoral Reform in 1916, and served on the Boundary Commission and on the Committee appointed to deal with the question of constitutional reform in India. Sir Walter was made a C.B. in 1912 and a K.C.B. in 1916.

10. Sir Alexander Oliver Riddell, D.L., LL.D., was in his 75th year. He was senior partner of the firm of Andrew Usher & Co., and was a member of the Royal Company of Architects. He was knighted in 1904.

11. **Sir Charles Edmund Fox, K.C.S.I.**, who was born in 1854, was called to the Bar in 1877. He served as Government Advocate, Burma, from 1884 to 1900, when he became Judge of the Chief Court, Lower Burma. He married the daughter of Sir Charles Parry Hobhouse, Bart.

12. **Captain Angus Alexander Mackintosh**, only son of The Mackintosh of Mackintosh, Chief of the Clan Chattan, was born in 1885. He had been attached for some time to the Embassy at Washington, and in 1917 he married Lady Maude Cavendish, daughter of the Duke of Devonshire, by whom he had a daughter.

14. **Mr. Justice Neville**, who was 70 years of age, was the son of Mr. Henry Neville, a surgeon of Esher. He was educated at Tonbridge School and at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where he took his degree in 1870. He was a good oar, rowing in the trial eights in 1868. In 1872 he was called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn, and as he was not able to obtain much work in London, he went to Liverpool, where he practised in the Chancery Court of the County Palatine of Lancaster, and in the Court of Passage. He soon built up a large practice as a junior in these Courts, and on the Northern Circuit, and later he returned to London, and took silk in 1888. He quickly gained the leading practice in the Court of Mr. Justice Kekewich, and in that of Mr. Justice Romer. He was a clever advocate by nature, and was gifted with the faculty of persuasive dealing with witnesses, and with that of following the mind of the Judge before whom he was practising. Mr. Neville was an untiring and indefatigable worker, and possessed great powers of physical endurance. He was a keen politician, and as a Gladstonian Liberal successfully opposed Mr. Goschen in the Exchange Division of Liverpool, retaining his seat five years later against Mr. Bigham. In 1906 he was raised to the Bench, and though his judgments were at first thought to be rather hasty he soon remedied this, and he was universally esteemed for his painstaking methods and his courtesy. He fought steadily against attacks of illness which began to trouble him in 1915, and much regret was expressed at his death. In 1872 he married Miss Edith Macnamara, the daughter of a County Court Judge.

15. **Sir Frederick Robert Up-**

cott, K.C.V.O., C.S.I., was 71 years of age. He was educated at Sherbourne School and at King's College, London, and when he was twenty-one he went to India as a "Stanley" engineer. He was officially commended for railway service in the Afghan War, and for the part taken by him in the building of the Victoria bridge over the Jhelum, and in the construction of the Sind-Sagar line. From 1893 to 1896 he was consulting railway engineer in Madras, and he then went to headquarters as Director-General of Railways, becoming later Railway Secretary in the Public Works Department. In 1901, when he was appointed Government-Director of Indian Railways, he came home; but he returned to India in 1905 to serve as Chairman of the Railway Board. He held this position for three years, his experience being of great usefulness in the working out of Lord Curzon's transformation of Indian Railway Administration. Sir Frederick was knighted during the Indian tour of the Prince and Princess of Wales in 1905. He married Miss Jessie Turner in 1878.

15. **Lieut.-General George Hay Moncrieff**, Colonel, the Royal Scots, was in his 83rd year. His father was in command of the Scots Guards, and served with him at one time in the Scottish Fusilier Guards. General Moncrieff fought in the Crimea, and received the Sebastopol medal and clasp, and also the Turkish medal. From 1891 to 1895 he commanded the Dublin district, and retired from the Army in 1900. He then devoted himself to charitable work, particularly in connexion with the Royal Caledonian Schools at Bushey, with which he had been associated for forty-five years.

— **Joseph Prior**, Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, took his degree as Eleventh Wrangler in 1858, and two years later was elected to a Fellowship. He was a popular tutor in mathematics for many years, and held the office of Senior Tutor of Trinity for a period, which was prolonged in order to enable him to supervise the studies of the late Duke of Clarence.

18. **Major the Hon. Charles Henry Lyell**, Assistant Military Attaché at Washington, was the only son and heir of Lord Lyell. He was born in 1875, and was educated at Eton and New College, Oxford. He

became Parliamentary Private Secretary to Sir Edward Grey and Mr. Asquith successively, and from 1904 to 1910 he sat as member for East Dorset. From 1910 to 1917 he represented South Edinburgh. In September, 1914, he was gazetted Captain in the Fife R.G.A., and was promoted Major in 1915. Major Lyell was married, in 1911, to Miss Rosalind Margaret Watney, by whom he had a son and daughter.

18. Colonel Richard Hamilton Rawson, M.P., who sat for the Reigate Division of Surrey, was in his 56th year. He was educated at Eton and Brasenose College, Oxford, and in 1890 he married Lady Beatrice, a daughter of the second Earl of Lichfield. He served for nine years in the 1st Life Guards, retiring with the rank of Captain in 1892, and from 1908 to 1914 he was Colonel commanding the Sussex Yeomanry. He had sat in Parliament as a Unionist since 1910. He left one son and two daughters.

19. Sir Edward Fry, who was 91 years of age, was a member of an old Quaker family, and was the only one of his community who has ever become an English Judge. He was educated at the College at Bristol, and at University College, London. In 1851 he graduated in the University of London, taking honours in classics and in animal physiology. He was called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn in 1854, and in 1858 he published his great work on the "Specific Performance of Contracts." In 1869 he took silk, and practised first before James, and afterwards before Bacon and Lord Romilly. It was by intellectual force that Mr. Fry made his way; his appearance and manner were cold and austere, but his accuracy was remarkable. In 1877 an Act was passed to create a new Equity Judge, and Fry, as the first man at the Chancery Bar, was chosen to fill the post. He proved himself expeditious and sound, and in 1883 he became a Lord Justice of Appeal. His mind was one of great independence of thought, and on occasion he did not fear to differ from his colleagues even on subjects which were new to him. Though he was an intensely serious man, he had the gift of a ready wit, and his apt illustrations were always striking. In 1892 he retired from the Bench; but he emerged from seclusion from time to time to render public service to the country. In 1897 he presided over the Royal Commission on the Irish Land

Question, and in 1902 he accepted the chairmanship of the Court of Arbitration established by the Metropolitan Water Act. In 1906 Sir Edward became Chairman of the Royal Commission which was appointed with respect to Trinity College, Dublin, and Dublin University. In international affairs also his services were several times in demand. In 1904 he was made Legal Assessor in respect of the North Sea incident, and the Russian Admiral's strange conduct. He was a permanent member of the Hague Court of Arbitration, and he was chosen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and First British Plenipotentiary to the Second Conference in June, 1907. On this occasion his cool judgment and common sense were most valuable to his country, as he refused to be carried away by Utopian schemes, or to accede to any proposals which might have hampered Great Britain's freedom of action in emergency. Sir Edward was an accomplished naturalist, and published in 1892 a book on British mosses. He was a Fellow of the Royal Society and of the Linnean Society. As a young man he published works of Quaker theology, and in 1899 a biography of Tuke. He married, in 1859, Miss Mariabella Hodgkin of Lewes, by whom he had a family.

20. Sir Edward Webley-Parry-Pryse, Bart., was in his 57th year. He was Captain in a Welsh regiment, and during the Boer War he served on Lord Roberts' staff. When the European War broke out he rejoined, and went to the front where he saw much service. He married Miss Webley-Parry in 1891, and assumed her surname in 1892. He was succeeded by his brother.

— **Mr. Cowley Lambert** was 66 years of age. He represented East Islington in the Unionist interest in Parliament from 1886 to 1892.

23. Robert Brudenell Carter, who was born in 1828, was the son of Major Thomas Carter of the Royal Marines. He received his medical training at the London Hospital, and in 1851 became a member of the Royal College of Surgeons. In 1852 he took the Diploma of the Society of Apothecaries, and went into practice at Leytonstone. In the following year he published a book on "The Pathology and Treatment of Hysteria," which was a rather remarkable production for such a young man. He

had a restless temperament, and the Crimean War gave him the chance of travel and adventure. He became a Staff-Surgeon in Turkey, and during the campaign he contributed a series of letters from the front to *The Times*. On returning to England he practised first in the suburbs of London and afterwards in Nottingham, becoming especially interested in diseases of the eye, in education, and in nervous diseases. He published several essays on these subjects, and he was altogether of too remarkable a mental calibre to continue in general practice. Hence, after a further six years at Stroud, he moved, in 1863, to London, where he renewed his connexion with *The Times*, to which he contributed regularly, and in less than two years he became ophthalmic surgeon on the staff of St. George's Hospital. He did not retire from this hospital until 1898, and he was connected with numerous other institutions. At one time he conducted, for the Government, an investigation into the eyesight of London school children. His many published works included "A Practical Treatise on Diseases of the Eye" (1875), which was regarded as the best English textbook on the subject; and "Doctors and their Work" (1903), a book for the general public. Mr. Carter's writing was remarkable for its literary style as well as for its display of learning. He held at one time the Presidency of the Medical Society of London, and was a "Knight of Justice" of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem.

23. Miss Agnes Weston, G.B.E., was the daughter of a barrister, and was born in London in 1840. Her family moved to Bath while she was still a child, and in 1868 she took up hospital visiting and parish work. From the simple incident of writing letters to a seaman who asked for a lady to correspond with him, Miss Weston's great work as "The Sailor's Friend" developed. She issued monthly printed letters to the Service, known as "Blue-backs." At first only a few hundreds were required, but the issue increased to over half a million. Miss Weston soon became the active Superintendent of the "Royal Naval Temperance Society," which extended its work very widely under her care. In 1876 she and her friend Miss Wintz started a "Sailor's Rest" in Devonport. This was seen at once to meet a great need. It combined the advantages of a temperance public-house, recreation rooms, and sleeping accommodation,

and the work grew to such an extent that several public-houses were bought up, their sites utilised, and a large range of buildings was erected opposite the dockyard gates. Queen Victoria subscribed to the work in 1895, and King George, in addition to personal congratulations to Miss Weston on previous occasions, conferred the G.B.E. upon her in 1918.

26. The Rev. Canon Alfred Merle Norman, F.R.S., LL.D., D.C.L., was born in 1831, and was educated at Winchester and Christ Church, Oxford. He was always destined for Holy Orders, and in due course he became Rector of Houghton-le-Spring, Co. Durham, and an honorary Canon of Durham. At the age of twenty he published his first paper on natural history, and he became well known for his sea-dredging expeditions which ranged over the North Sea to the Norwegian fjords, to the Shetlands, and to the Atlantic. By these cruises he became possessed of a great collection of crustaceans, echinoderms, corals, and various groups of mollusca. This collection was acquired by the Trustees of the British Museum. Canon Norman's services to science were recognised by many eminent zoologists in Great Britain and on the Continent. Besides working on the collections received from the dredging expeditions of British vessels, he accepted the invitation of the French Government to co-operate with French zoologists in the cruises of the *Talisman* and *Travailleur*. He continued to publish papers on marine invertebrates until 1908. Canon Norman was at one time President of the Conchological Society, and of the Museums Association, and he received the gold medal of the Linnæan Society in 1906. He was also the recipient from the Institut de France of the medal struck in honour of the French expeditions in which he took part.

— **The Right Rev. William Boyd Carpenter, D.D., K.C.V.O., Sub-dean and Canon of Westminster,** was born in 1841, and was the son of the Rev. H. Carpenter of Liverpool. He was educated at the Royal Institution School, Liverpool, and at St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, where he held a scholarship, and graduated as a "senior optime" in the Mathematical Tripos in 1864. He was ordained the same year, and until 1870 he served, in succession, curacies at Maidstone, Clapham, and Lee, and he was then appointed to the benefice of St. James's,

Holloway. This preferment he owed probably as much to his powers of preaching as to his identification with the Evangelical school of thought. While he was at St. James's his sermons attracted crowded congregations, and he was pronounced by Canon Liddon to be "the best preacher in the Church of England." In 1879 Dr. Jackson, Bishop of London, appointed him to the living of Christ Church, Lancaster Gate, and in 1882 he became a Canon Residentiary of Windsor. Two years later he was made Bishop of Ripon, and there as elsewhere preaching was the particular part of his work in which he shone. He made great use of his powers among the working men of Leeds, and gave much time and infinite care to the preparation of his sermons. In 1911 the Bishop resigned his See, owing to ill-health, but he was able to accept a Canonry of Westminster, and later succeeded Dr. Henson as Sub-Dean. Bishop Boyd Carpenter was chosen to preach on many great occasions. At the 1887 Jubilee before the Houses of Parliament, and at the Y.M.C.A. Jubilee at St. Paul's he was selected to address vast gatherings. He was Hulsean Lecturer at Cambridge in 1878, Bampton Lecturer at Oxford in 1889, and gave (taking preaching as his subject) lectures on Pastoral Theology at Cambridge. This last was one of his most useful and practical works. He was not a deeply-learned theologian, and, when printed, his sermons were sometimes disappointing to those who had been carried away by his eloquence and graces of manner and voice in the pulpit. The Bishop was an earnest worker in the cause of Christian eugenics. He was a great favourite with Queen Victoria who constantly summoned him to preach before her. He was twice married, and left eleven children.

26. Miss Meresia Dorothy Augusta Nevill was the daughter of Mr. Reginald and Lady Dorothy Nevill, and was born in 1849. She had remarkable gifts for political speaking and organisation, and from the beginning of its existence she was a devoted worker on behalf of the Primrose League. She was an unrivalled canvasser at all London elections (Parliamentary, County Council, and School Board), and she was a humorous, enthusiastic, and genial platform speaker. She was for a long time treasurer of the Ladies' Grand Council of the Primrose League, and in 1907 her services were recognised by the pres-

entation to her of the Grand Star of the League in diamonds.

27. The Right Rev. Dr. William Walsh, Canon and Archdeacon of Canterbury, was in his 83rd year. He was educated at St. Alban's Hall, Oxford, and took his degree in 1859. He was ordained the following year, and served in succession curacies in Horsell and Chelsea. In 1865 he was made Association Secretary for the Church Missionary Society in Kent, Surrey, and Sussex, and in 1870 he was appointed Superintendent and Clerical Secretary of the London Diocesan Home Mission. After holding successively the benefices of St. Andrew, Watford, and St. Matthew, Newington, he returned in 1886 to his work for the Home Mission, with which he combined the duties of mission chaplain to Dr. Temple, Bishop of London, who made him a Prebendary of St. Paul's. In 1891 he became Bishop of Mauritius, and when in the following year great devastation was caused in Port Louis by a terrible hurricane, he converted his Cathedral into a hospital for the injured of all creeds and races. This act was the cause of a great increase of brotherly feeling in the island, a sentiment which the Bishop fostered. In 1897 he returned to England to take up the duties of his new appointments of Archdeacon and Canon of Canterbury and Assistant Bishop to Archbishop Temple. In 1898 he became Suffragan Bishop of Dover, and he held that office until about two years before his death. The Bishop was well known for his powers of organisation and his unremitting work. He married, in 1865, the daughter of General Pickering, R.A., and two sons survived him.

28. Admiral Sir Albert Hastings Markham, K.C.B., who was born in 1841, was the son of Captain John Markham, R.N. He was educated at home, and at Eastman's Royal Naval Academy, Southsea, and entered the Navy as a cadet in 1856. He served in H.M.S. *Imperieuse* in 1861 when the Taku Forts were captured, and at Peking. He was in command of the Training Squadron from 1886 to 1889, and, attaining flag rank in 1891, he was second-in-command of the Mediterranean Fleet from 1892 to 1894. Admiral Markham was flying his flag in H.M.S. *Camperdown* when that vessel rammed H.M.S. *Victoria* in the Mediterranean in 1893. In 1894 he married Miss Gervers, and in 1901 was made Commander-in-Chief at the

Nora. He was created K.C.B. in 1908, and retired in 1906. In 1875 Sir Albert Markham joined Sir George Nares's Polar expedition which was equipped by the Government. He was second-in-command of the *Alert*, and was made leader of a party which was to push its way Polewards from the expedition's winter quarters in Greenhill Land in April, 1876. In spite of formidable obstacles the party reached the latitude of 88° 20' 28", the "farthest North" that had ever been reached. Sir Albert Markham made other expeditions in 1879 and in 1886. The latter was into Hudson's Bay with a Canadian Government expedition, for which he received that Government's thanks. He published several lives of explorers, an account of his own "Polar Reconnaissance," and served on the Councils of the Royal Geographical Society and other bodies for the encouragement of travel.

28. Sir Philip Gregory, who was 77 years of age, was the son of Mr. John Gregory, who was Governor of the Bahamas. He was educated at Eton and at King's College, Cambridge, and in 1878 he took his degree as Tenth Wrangler. In 1875 he was called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn, and became an equity draftsman. From January, 1918, he was second in seniority of the conveyancing counsel of the Court, having been appointed to that position in 1902. In 1907 he was elected a Bencher of Lincoln's Inn, and the following year he was appointed a member of the Royal Commission instituted for the purpose of drafting the Land Transfer Acts. Later he became a member of the Rule Committee under those Acts, and he was knighted in 1913. Sir Philip married Miss Edith Anne James in 1876, and had one son.

NOVEMBER.

1. Laurence Jerrold, who was born in 1873, was the son of Mr. Blanchard Jerrold, an old resident of Paris, and the grandson of Douglas Jerrold. He himself lived in Paris, and studied at the University. He published books on the subjects of France and the French character, and was the chief correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* in Paris. He knew his subject as did few Englishmen, and did much to bring about the "Entente Cordiale." His last book, "France To-day," published in 1916, showed him to possess analytical gifts of a high order.

2. Coplestone Richard George Warwick Bamfylde, third Baron Poltmore, was born in 1859. He was at one time a Lieutenant in the 1st Life Guards, and a Captain of the North Devon Yeomanry. He succeeded his father in 1908. Lord Poltmore suffered from indifferent health which prevented his taking any prominent part in public affairs, but he gained much esteem by his generosity as a landlord and employer. He was a keen agriculturist and had a famous Stud of Shire horses. In politics he was a Liberal-Unionist, but he was never entirely in agreement with the whole policy of Unionism. At the outbreak of the war he became actively and generously interested in the Devon Patriotic Fund, and in other agencies of a similar character, and he fitted up one of his houses as a

convalescent home for soldiers. He was succeeded by Major the Hon. G. W. W. Bamfylde, the eldest son of his marriage with the daughter of the first Baron Allendale.

2. Bernard Capes, the novelist, published the book that made his name, "The Lake of Wine," in 1898, and from that time onwards he produced volumes at the rate of at least one a year. His novels were eminently readable and mostly of the "adventure" order. Latterly he made use of historical characters and places, and dealt successfully with them, especially in "Where England Sets her Feet," an Elizabethan romance.

— **Sir Alfred Kensington** was 63 years of age. He was educated at Marlborough and at University College, Oxford, and entered the Indian Civil Service in 1875. After serving in connexion with land settlement work in the Punjab, he became, in 1890, Under-Secretary to the Government of India in the Finance and Commerce Department. In 1894 he returned to the Punjab as a district officer, and two years later he was made a Divisional Judge. At the end of 1904 he was appointed to the Chief Court of the Province, and in January, 1914, he became Chief Judge and received the honour of knighthood. He retired in 1915. Sir Alfred married a daughter of Major-General Johnstone, C.B., in

1881, and had two sons and two daughters.

2. Lieut.-Colonel his Highness the Maharaja of Rewa was born in 1876, and succeeded to his title in 1880. He was very successful in his conduct of famine relief operations, and for this he received the G.C.S.I. in 1897.

3. Mrs. Russell Sage was born at Syracuse, New York, in 1828. Her maiden name was Slocum, and she graduated at Troy Female Seminary in 1847. In 1869 she married Mr. Russell Sage, who died in 1906 leaving a fortune of about 15,000,000., almost the whole of which was inherited by his widow. Mrs. Sage proceeded to dispose of the great bulk of this money in charitable schemes. She set aside 2,000,000. for the Sage Foundation, an institution founded for the betterment of social conditions in the United States. The means employed for the attainment of that purpose were scientific research, publication, education, and the establishment and maintenance of charitable institutions. Mrs. Sage received the honorary degree of Mistress of Letters from New York University in recognition of her public work.

— **Frank H. Dale, C.B.**, was educated at St. Paul's School and at Balliol College, Oxford, where he was first classical scholar in 1892. During his four years at Oxford he won the Ireland and the Derby Scholarships, and other University prizes. He was made a Fellow of Merton College, and lectured for a time at University College, and in 1897 he was appointed an Examiner of the Education Department. In 1913 he was appointed Chief Inspector of Elementary Schools, and he also received the honour of a C.B. Mr. Dale rendered valuable services to the cause of education, and his death at the age of 46 was a great loss to his profession. His "Reports on Irish Elementary and Intermediate Education," published in 1903 and 1904, are well known.

4. Sir James William Restler, K.B.E., M.Inst.C.E., M.I.Mech.E., was born in 1851. He was educated privately and at King's College, and in 1889 he was made Chief Engineer to the Southwark and Vauxhall Water Company. He passed with this company to the Metropolitan Water Board, of which he became Chief

Engineer in 1904. Sir James was Chairman of the Metropolitan Munitions Committee. He was knighted in June, 1918. He married Miss Janet Ferguson Creighton in 1876, and had three children.

4. Mary Jane, Countess of Meath, was born in 1847, and was the daughter of the eleventh Earl of Lauderdale. She married Lord Meath in 1868. Lady Meath was well known for her interest in charitable work. She founded the Ministering Children's League, the Brabazon Employment Scheme for old workhouse people, and homes for epileptics in England, and for the blind in Egypt. She left three sons and two daughters.

5. Sir Ernest Frederick Schiff was born in Austria in 1840. He was a member of the firm of stockbrokers known as Messrs. A. G. Schiff & Co., of Warrford Court, E.C. He had been a member of the House for forty-one years. He was a clever business man, but in recent years had not appeared much in the Stock Exchange. He was a Knight of Grace of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, and he founded a home for surgical convalescents in Kent.

7. Sir Henry Austin Lee, C.B., K.C.M.G., was born in 1847 in Ceylon, and was the son of Mr. G. A. Lee of Guernsey. He was educated at Elizabeth College, Guernsey, and Pembroke College, Oxford, where he held a classical scholarship and exhibition. In the middle of his examination for honours in "Greats" he was unfortunately taken ill, and so he only obtained a pass degree. He served with the Red Cross in the Franco-Prussian War, and at the end of 1870 he entered the Foreign Office. He possessed a natural gift for languages, and in 1876 he joined Lord Salisbury's mission to Constantinople as Assistant Private Secretary to Montagu Lowry-Corry. Two years later he became Assistant Private Secretary to Lord Beaconsfield during the Congress at Berlin, and here he distinguished himself so highly as to earn from his Chief the title of the "Admirable Crichton." In 1892 he married Miss Madeleine Smith of New York, and received the C.B., and on transferring to the Diplomatic Service he became Attaché at the British Embassy in Paris. He was Private Secretary to Lord Lytton and later to Lord Dufferin, and after the departure of the latter, he decided to settle permanently in Paris, and became Com-

mercial Attaché. Sir Henry had many important friends, among them Gambetta, Thiers, and Lord Bertie, and his popularity in the social and business worlds was deservedly great. He was one of the British representatives on the council of the Suez Canal Company in 1891, and later became resident director in Paris, and a member of the managing committee. He was created a K.C.M.G. in 1902.

7. J. D. Langton, who died very suddenly at His Majesty's Theatre, of which he was the general manager, was 60 years of age. He became a solicitor in 1880, and in 1899 he was appointed Under-Sheriff of the City of London, a post he held for twelve years. He was a prominent Freemason, being a member of several lodges, Deputy Grand Master for Surrey, Past Deputy Grand Director of Ceremonies, and Past Grand Deacon of the Grand Lodge. He was also prominently associated with Masonic charities and was Honorary Solicitor and Secretary to King George's Pension Fund.

— **William Willans Asquith**, who was the elder brother of Mr. H. H. Asquith, was born in 1851. He was educated at the City of London School and at Balliol College, Oxford, where he was a minor exhibitor. He took a second class in Classical Moderations in 1872, and a first in Lit. Hum. in 1875. For many years he worked with great ability and success as an assistant master at Clifton. He retired in 1910.

— **Colonel Cyril William Bell Bowdler, C.B.**, was born in 1839. He joined the 8th Hussars in 1864, and retired from the Army in 1891. In 1895 he became Deputy Commissioner for the London District of the St. John's Ambulance Brigade, and in 1898 he was made Chief Commissioner. He resigned in 1903, but remained Commissioner for Special Services. He originated the Bearer Corps of the Brigade, and the Royal Naval Auxiliary Sick Berth Reserve, which was mobilised twenty-four hours after the declaration of war in 1914. He was made a Knight of Grace of the Order of St. John in 1891, and a Knight of Justice in 1903. Colonel Bowdler was a remarkable organiser and disciplinarian, and was a man of many parts, being a doctor of music and of laws, a barrister, a linguist, and a medical man.

— **The Rev. Edward Carus Selwyn, D.D.**, was born in 1853, and was the son of the Rev. E. J. Selwyn,

a relation of the famous Primate of New Zealand. He was a King's Scholar at Eton, and held three scholarships at King's College, Cambridge, and was three times Browne's medallist. He became a Fellow and Lecturer at King's College, and after being ordained and doing some parish work in the North, he became Principal of Liverpool College in 1882. In 1887 he went to Uppingham where he held with success the post of Head Master for twenty years. After he had retired he gave himself to Biblical research, and published works which showed sound and exact scholarship, dealing chiefly with the relation between the Christian documents and Jewish prophetic literature as interpreted by the Septuagint. Dr. Selwyn was twice married, his first wife being a daughter of Thomas Arnold, and a grand-daughter of Dr. Arnold of Rugby. His six sons and one daughter all served their country in the war, three of the sons losing their lives.

8. Sir George John Armytage, Bart., was 76 years of age. He succeeded his father as sixth baronet in 1899. He was one of the founders of the Harleian Society, and Chairman of its Council. He was twice married, and was succeeded by his son Brigadier-General G. S. Armytage.

9. General Sir Peter Stark Lumsden, G.C.B., C.S.I., died on his 89th birthday. He was the fourth son of Colonel Thomas Lumsden, C.B., and a brother of that "Lumsden of the Guides" whose life he published in 1899. He was educated at Addiscombe, and in 1847 he entered the Indian Army as an ensign. From 1852 to 1856 he took part in almost every fight on the North-West frontier, and he received a medal and clasp and was frequently mentioned in dispatches. In 1857 he went with his elder brother and Dr. Bellew on a special mission to Afghanistan, returning about May, 1858, to India, where he was able to take part in the final suppression of the Mutiny. For these services he received a medal, and he was thanked by the Government for his work in Afghanistan. He was appointed D.A.A. and Q.M.G. on the staff of Sir Robert Napier's Second Division in 1860, and took part in the British and French Allied campaign in China, after which he was promoted Brevet-Major and received a medal with two clasps. He also served in the Bhutan campaign of 1865, being awarded a clasp. Lumsden was promoted Lieutenant-Colonel in

1866, and Colonel in 1870. At that time he was appointed A.D.C. to the Queen, and received the C.S.I. He held various important staff appointments before his return home, and was knighted in 1879. Sir Peter Lumsden was selected by Mr. Gladstone's Government to represent his country on the Anglo-Russian Commission which was to settle the Afghan frontier question. He believed that he would have the support of his Government in claiming the whole of the Badkhees district for the Ameer, and a collision between Russian and Afghan forces, which occurred near Penjdeh, nearly caused war between England and Russia. Lumsden was ordered to remain passive while the two Governments conferred, and finally a frontier line was arranged far south of that favoured by the Commissioner, who was declared to be of too great importance and too high rank for his task. He returned to England, and a few weeks later Lord Salisbury came into power and bestowed the G.C.B. on him as a reward for his services in this difficult matter. Sir Peter then worked once more at the India Office, retiring in 1893 to his estate in Aberdeenshire, where he lived the life of a country gentleman, becoming a J.P. and D.L. for Aberdeenshire and Banff. He married, in 1862, Miss Mary Marriott.

9. The Rev. Frederick William Edmondson was born in 1840, and was a member of an old Glamorgan county family. He was educated at Cowbridge Grammar School, and Jesus College, Oxford, where he held a scholarship, and was an exhibitioner. He was in succession Rector of Michaelstone with St. Bride-super-Ely, Cardiff, and of Coity with Nolton. In 1873 he became Honorary Secretary of the Llandaff Diocesan Church Building Society, and he was also Secretary for many years of the Diocesan Conference. In 1897 he was appointed Archdeacon and Chancellor of Llandaff, and three years later became one of the Bishop's chaplains. In 1905, much to the regret of his friends in the diocese, he declined the Bishopric, partly on account of his age. In 1913 he resigned the office of Archdeacon, but he accepted that of Rural Dean of Groneath Lower (Western Division).

— **Captain the Marquess Conyngham** was a son of the fourth Marquess, and was 35 years of age. In September, 1914, he became a Lieutenant in the South Irish Horse, and was in the Special Reserve of

Officers. About a year before his death he was appointed A.D.C. to Lieut.-General the Hon. Sir John Maxwell, General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, Northern Command. Lord Conyngham's successor was his brother, Lord Frederick William Burton Conyngham.

9. Count Eugenio Martinengo Cesaresco, who was in his 85th year, was the owner of the historic Palazzo Martinengo, Lago di Garda. He published several works on horsemanship, and was an Italian of the old school, of simple habits, and much attached to England. He married a daughter of the late Dean Carrington.

11. Sir Hermann Weber, M.D., F.R.C.P., was in his 95th year. He was the son of a German father and an Italian mother, and his early years were spent on his father's farms in Bavaria and Hesse-Cassel. He began to study medicine at Marburg, and took his M.D. degree at Bonn in 1848. He had studied the English language for the sake of reading Shakespeare in the original, and this brought him into touch with the English residents and visitors at Bonn. He had already met Carlyle at Marburg, and he also became acquainted with Sir James Simpson, who had discovered the use of chloroform as an anæsthetic. He was therefore glad to accept the position of house physician at the German Hospital at Dalston. He intended returning to Germany after a few years, but he made so many friends, that, when his appointment came to an end, he started in private practice in England. In 1854 he married an Englishwoman, and in order to obtain an English qualification he studied at Guy's Hospital. In 1855 he became a Member of the Royal College of Physicians, and a Fellow four years later. Dr. Weber soon came into prominence as a pioneer of open-air treatment for consumption. He sent his patients to winter in the Engadine, and he himself, in their interest, spent his yearly holidays in visits to all the Alpine country. He developed into an enthusiastic climber, and continued to pass his vacations in climbing expeditions, until he reached his 80th year. In 1899 he was appointed by the Prince of Wales as a delegate to the Berlin Congress on the Prevention of Tuberculosis, and he was knighted the same year. Sir Hermann retired from practice at the age of 80, but his interest in hygiene and medical science remained unabated, and he

continued to write on these subjects. His own health and strength were remarkable, and he took open-air exercise in all weathers in his 95th year. He held various positions on learned societies, published works on hygiene and climbing, and was intimate with the leading men of many different circles. Sir Hermann's sympathies during the war were entirely with his adopted country, for which six of his descendants fought.

12. Dr. Augustus Frederic Rudolf Hoernle, C.I.E., was 77 years of age. He studied at the Universities of Basel, Thubingen, and London, and from 1865 to 1870 he served the Church Missionary Society at Meerut. He then became Professor at Jay Narain's College, Benares, and in 1877 he was appointed Principal of the Cathedral Mission College, Calcutta. From 1881 until he retired to England in 1899 he was Principal of the Calcutta Madrasah. Dr. Hoernle then resided in Oxford where he published some of the results of his painstaking and exact study of Oriental documents, disclosing important historical and philological facts. He translated the famous Bower MSS., the birch-bark codex discovered in Khotan in 1890, and he took part in editing Central Asian texts. Oxford conferred the degree of M.A. upon him, and Thubingen that of Ph.D.

13. Robert Wellesley Grosvenor, second Baron Ebury, was a son of the first baron and Charlotte, daughter of the first Lord Cowley. He was born in 1834, and was educated at Harrow and at King's College, London. In 1853 he entered the 1st Life Guards, and he also served in the Cheshire Yeomanry. He represented Westminster as a Liberal in Parliament from 1865 to 1874. In 1893 he succeeded his father. He was a D.L. for Northants, and was at one time Chairman of various limited companies. He married, in 1867, the Hon. Emilie Beaujolais White, F.Z.S., and was succeeded by his eldest son, the Hon. Robert Victor Grosvenor.

15. Sir Robert Anderson, K.C.B., LL.D., was born in 1841, and was the son of Mr. Matthew Anderson, who was Crown Solicitor in Dublin. He was educated at Boulogne, Paris, and Trinity College, and was called to the Irish Bar. In 1865 he became possessed of the information which led the Irish Government to arrest those who, at the State trials of that year, were charged with treason-felony. The

next year he was given the task of preparing for the new Chief Secretary, Lord Naas, a précis of all the secret documents relating to this subject which had accumulated at Dublin Castle. Thus his special knowledge of the ways of Irish political conspiracy became acknowledged in Dublin and London. After the Clerkenwell explosion in 1867 (of which he had sent a previous warning to the police) a Secret Service Department was organised, of which Anderson was asked to take charge. The department's existence came to an end in three months, and its head was then requested to take over the care of Irish affairs at the Home Office. Here he was extremely successful in dealing with the Fenians whose plots gave rise to some trouble in 1869 and 1870, and he performed secretarial work for several Royal Commissions. In 1877, however, he left the Civil Service hoping to resume professional and literary work. But in 1880 the fresh outbreak of Irish plotting caused Sir William Harcourt, then Home Secretary, to ask Mr. Anderson's aid in dealing with it. Most reluctantly he consented, and after the murder of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke he represented in London the Irish Department for Police and Crime. He worked actively against the dynamiters, and in 1888 he was made head of the Criminal Investigation Department and was "ex officio" an Assistant Commissioner of Police. At that moment the Parnell Commission began its sittings, and in Anderson's own words "the Le Caron affair dragged him into fame." A great controversy (in which Ministers and ex-Ministers took part) was waged as to the strict official propriety of his conduct in making use, in letters to *The Times*, of facts which had come to his knowledge in his official capacity. He maintained the propriety of his conduct, and until 1901, when he retired with the honour of a K.C.B., he directed the Criminal Investigation Department in an able manner. Sir Robert then published books of his own recollections and some theological works. He married, in 1873, Lady Agnes Moore, sister of the ninth Earl of Drogheda, and had four children.

15. Mrs. Childe-Pemberton was born in January, 1820. She was the daughter of Henry Davenport Shakespeare, a member of the Supreme Council of India in Lord Amherst's Government, and her grandfather, John Shakespeare, held a similar position in

the days of Warren Hastings. She married the late Mr. C. O. Child-Pemberton in 1849.

15. **Miss Nelly Erichsen** was well known in England, Italy, and America as a black-and-white artist. She illustrated many books on Italian travel, and several volumes of Messrs. Macmillan's "Highways and Byways" series, and she also did some sketches for Mrs. Janet Ross's book, "Florentine Villas." Miss Erichsen had been residing for three years in the Province of Lucca, where she was working for the English propaganda, and where in the autumn of 1917 she helped to provide relief for the refugees who fled there after the Battle of Caporetto. It was while nursing the victims of the influenza epidemic that she herself contracted the disease, of which she died.

16. **George Pringle Rose, C.I.E.**, was born in 1855, and was the son of the Rev. Donaldson Rose of Brechin. He was educated at Aberdeen University and Cooper's Hill R.I.E. College, and in 1877 he became an Assistant Engineer on the Indian State Railways. From 1884 to 1887 he served on the construction of the Sind-Peshin Railway, and received the thanks of the Government of India for his capable executive work in the section comprising the Chappar Rift Works and Bridge. In his dealings with the wild border men he displayed great tact and resource. Mr. Rose next became Superintendent of Works for the Sind-Peshin Extension Railway from Quetta to New Chaman, and was in charge from 1888 to 1891 of the Khojak Tunnel works. He carried the rails through the Khwaja Amran range on to the plains of Kandahar and Herat, and for this difficult work he received the thanks of the Secretary of State, the Viceroy, and the Commander-in-Chief of India, and in 1892 was made a C.I.E. Subsequently Mr. Rose was Deputy-Manager of the North-Western State Railway, Adviser on Railway Policy to the Nizam's Government, and Engineer-in-Chief of the survey operations and construction of the Hyderabad-Godavery Valley Railway successively. After a term of service in Calcutta as Junior Consulting Engineer for Railways to the Government of India, he retired in 1904.

— **Sir Mitchell Mitchell-Thompson, Bt., D.L., F.R.S.E., F.S.A.**, was born in 1846. He was educated at Alloa and in Edinburgh.

He was Lord Provost of Edinburgh from 1897 to 1900, a member of the Royal Company of Archers, and a Knight of Grace of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem. He married, in 1880, a daughter of Mr. Robert Cook of Leith, and had three children. His successor was his son, Sir William Mitchell-Thompson, K.B.E., the Unionist M.P. for North Down.

18. **James Branch** was born in 1845 at Bethnal Green, where he subsequently carried on business as a boot manufacturer. From 1888 to 1906 he was a member of the London County Council, and from 1906 to 1910 he represented Bethnal Green in the House of Commons as a Liberal.

— **General Sir Robert Biddulph, G.C.B., G.C.M.G.**, was in his 84th year. He was the son of Mr. Robert Biddulph of Ledbury, who was at one time M.P. for Hereford, and was a brother of Lord Biddulph. He was educated in London, and entered the Royal Artillery as a Second Lieutenant in 1858. In 1854 he went to the Crimea where he fought at Alma, at Balaklava, and at the siege of Sebastopol. In 1855 he went with the English and French forces to Kertsch, proceeding afterwards to India and taking part in 1857-59 in the suppression of the Mutiny, including the siege and capture of Lucknow. In October, 1858, he was made Deputy Assistant Adjutant-General of the Oude Field Force, and he was present at the operations in Byswarra, the passage of the Gogra, and in actions on the Nepal Frontier. He was twice mentioned in dispatches during the Mutiny, and he held his staff appointment until, in 1860, he became Captain, and was appointed Military Secretary in the Expedition to China. Here he served in various operations, including the capture of the Taku Forts, and he was present at the surrender of Peking. In 1861 he attained the rank of Brevet-Major and became Military Secretary in Madras, becoming a Brevet-Lieutenant-Colonel in 1864. He relinquished the secretaryship in the following year, and from 1868 to 1871 was Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General at Woolwich, and from 1871 to 1873 he was Private Secretary to Mr. (afterwards Lord) Cardwell. Colonel Biddulph then became Assistant Adjutant-General for the Auxiliary Forces at Army Headquarters, and in 1878 he became Her Majesty's Commissioner at Cyprus to arrange the payment due to the Porte,

From 1879 to 1886 he was High Commissioner and Commander-in-Chief at Cyprus, and was created a G.C.M.G. On his return home he filled various important posts at Army Headquarters until in 1898 he was made Governor of Gibraltar, where he remained until 1900. He became a G.C.B. in 1899. In 1864 he married Mrs. R. Stuart Palmer, by whom he had ten children.

20. Lieut.-Colonel L. W. Longstaff, late of the 1st V.B. East Yorks Regiment, was born in 1841, and was the son of George Dixon Longstaff, M.D. From 1860 to 1877 he lived at Hull, and was for a long period a director of Messrs. Blundell, Spence & Co., Ltd. He interested himself in schemes for the benefit of the employees, in the early Volunteer movement, and in the outfitting of Polar Expeditions. He resided later at Wimbledon where he gave generously of his time and money in support of war charities. He was connected with several scientific societies. He married in 1878, and left a widow and seven children.

21. Nottidge Charles Macnamara, who was 86, was educated at King's College, London, and on becoming a member of the Royal College of Surgeons at the age of 21, received a commission as Assistant Surgeon in the East India Company's service. He gained a reputation by his work on cholera, and his researches into the diseases of the eye prevalent in India, and in 1865 he became Surgeon to the Ophthalmic Hospital in Calcutta. Later he was instrumental in the building and endowing of the Mayo native hospital in that town, which was opened in 1873, and he then returned to England. He held appointments on the staff of the Westminster, and the Westminster Ophthalmic Hospitals, and was an Examiner, a Fellow, and (from 1893 to 1896) Vice-President of the Council of the Royal College of Surgeons. Mr. Macnamara published many works on Oriental diseases, and a book, "Instinct and Intelligence," when he was 83 years of age. He married the daughter of the Hon. W. B. Bayley, Judge of the High Court of Calcutta, and had eight children.

23. The Rev. George Herbert Bown, Bishop-elect of Nassau, W.I., was in his 47th year, and was the son of Mr. George Bown of Bromsgrove. He was educated at Bromsgrove School and Trinity College, Oxford, where he obtained firsts in Moderations in 1892,

and in Lit. Hum. in 1894. He then spent a year at St. Stephen's House, Oxford, where he returned as Principal after a period of service in the parish of Rowbarton to which he was ordained. He was Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Zanzibar, and as, owing to the war, there were no students at St. Stephen's House, Mr. Bown had recently been in charge of St. Alban's Mission Church, Cowley. He had a short time before his death been elected Bishop by the Synod of the Diocese of Nassau, in succession to Dr. Hornby, who had resigned the See.

23. Reginald Philip Gregory, M.A., who was a Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge, and University Lecturer in Botany, was born in 1870. He was educated at St. John's, where he took first-class honours in both parts of the Natural Sciences Tripos in 1900 and 1902, with special distinction in botany. In 1904 he gained the Walsingham medal for an essay showing results of original botanical research, and he became a Fellow of his College during the same year. Eight years later he was appointed tutor in Natural Science. During the war he first (as a Captain in the O.T.C.) instructed the cadets, and then went to France as a Second-Lieutenant in the 1/6 Gloucestershire Regiment. He was badly gassed, and on receiving his discharge in September, 1918, he returned to his tutorial work. Mr. Gregory was a hockey "half-blue" and had played cricket for Cambridgeshire. He married Miss Bisdee in 1908.

25. The Rev. Samuel George Phear, D.D., was in his 90th year. He was the son of the Rev. John Phear, M.A., Rector of Earl Stonham, Suffolk. In 1852 he graduated at Cambridge as Fourth Wrangler, and five years later he became an Examiner in the Mathematical Tripos. In 1871 he was elected Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and held this office for twenty-four years, introducing many reforms in the teaching system. From 1873 to 1881 he was Chaplain to the Bishop of Winchester, and in 1874 and 1875 he was Vice-Chancellor of the University. He never married, and after his retirement from the Mastership he was appointed a Senior Fellow of Emmanuel College.

— **William Eilerby Green** had been the senior partner in point of age and length of partnership in the publishing firm of Longmans, Green & Co.,

since the death of the fourth Thomas Longman in 1879. He was born in 1838, and was the son of Bevis Ellerby Green, who was a member of the firm from 1824 to 1866. In 1862 Mr. William Green went to Paternoster Row, and ten years later he became a partner. Eventually he controlled the country and export department in succession to his father, and he became well known to most booksellers over a long period of years. He was a shrewd judge of men and matters, and was extremely industrious and business-like, being for many years at his desk at nine o'clock every morning. He was gifted with an adaptability of mind, which enabled him to assimilate modern business methods. Mr. Green was admitted in 1857 to the Freedom and Livery of the Stationers' Company. His charitable interests were many. He belonged from 1862 to the Booksellers' Provident Institution, and was its Treasurer from 1884, and was also Treasurer to the Booksellers' Retreat at King's Langley. He was for many years a Governor of Christ's Hospital, and in 1906 he doubled the accommodation of the Victoria Hospital at Kingston-on-Thames, to which he afterwards presented a complete X-ray installation. The freedom of the borough of Kingston was conferred upon him in 1910 in recognition of his generosity. Mr. Green's home was at Teddington, and he took great pleasure in his garden there, being usually in it before six o'clock in the summer. He left a widow who shared in all his charitable works.

26. **Arthur Bell** was the author of a volume of Sussex poems, "The Dear Land of the Heart," and of "Leaders of English Literature," which was published in 1915.

27. **Sir George Dallas, Bart.**, was born in 1842, and was the son of the second baronet, and Frances, daughter of the first Lord Ellenborough. He was educated at Eton, Heidelberg, Dresden, and Paris, and in 1863 he was appointed to a clerkship in the Foreign Office. In 1873 he became Acting Second Secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and for some time he was employed on special service in Canada and the United States. In 1890 he became a Senior Clerk, a Chief Clerk in 1896, and he retired in 1900. Sir George married, in 1884, Felicia Mary, daughter of Canon Welby of Barrowby, Grantham.

27. **Thomas Humphrey Lyons**, who was born in 1880, was the son of the late Admiral of the Fleet, Sir Algernon McLennan Lyons, G.C.B. In 1905 he was nominated an Attaché in the Diplomatic Service, and he subsequently spent two and a half years in Cairo, over three years in Madrid, and in 1912 he was transferred to Peking. In 1915 he came to the Foreign Office, and was Secretary to Sir Maurice de Bunsen's mission in Mexico in 1918.

29. **Sir Charles Nicholson, Bart.**, who was 61 years of age, was the son of W. N. Nicholson, sometime a Master in Lunacy. He was educated at Charterhouse and Trinity College, Cambridge, and was subsequently called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn. In 1906 he became Liberal member for Doncaster, and he retained his seat until his death. In 1910 he was appointed Second Church Estates Commissioner, and in 1912 he was made a baronet. He was Chairman of the Board of Control of Regimental Institutes from 1915, and was also Vice-Chairman of the London War Pensions Committee. In 1892 Sir Charles married Miss Crossfield of Walton Lea, Warrington, by whom he had three children. His only son, Captain Nicholson, R.F.C., having been killed on active service in 1916, Sir Charles's grandson, John Norris Nicholson, succeeded to the baronetcy.

— **Captain Prince Antoine of Orleans and Braganza, M.C., A.D.C.**, Royal Canadian Dragoons, was born in Paris in 1881, and was the third son of Prince Gaston, Comte d'Eu, by his marriage with Princess Isabella of the former Imperial House of Brazil. He joined the British Army on the outbreak of war in 1914, and he held staff appointments under General Smith-Dorrien and Sir Charles Ferguson successively. In December, 1915, he was appointed Intelligence Officer to the Canadian Cavalry Brigade under Major-General Seely, whose aide-de-camp he was from March, 1916, to June, 1918. From that time he held a post in the Ministry of Munitions, and was employed on "liaison" duties. He was returning from France with dispatches by aeroplane when his pilot was obliged, owing to a fog, to make a forced landing at Old Southgate. The machine struck a cottage and the pilot was killed, and the Prince, who was severely injured, died later from the effects. He showed great gallantry under fire in France, and besides being awarded the Military Cross he had

been, only a few days before his death, recommended to the French Military authorities for the Croix de Guerre.

29. The Rev. James Allan Smith, D.D., Dean of St. Davids, was born in 1841, and was the son of the late Rev. J. A. Smith, Rector of Pyecombe, Sussex. He was educated privately and at Wadham College, Oxford, where he graduated M.A. in 1867, and D.D. in 1898. He served a London curacy from 1864 to 1866 and then became Lecturer at Boston, Lincolnshire, for five years. After holding in succession the benefices of Holy Trinity, Nottingham, Swansea, and Hay he became in 1903 Dean of St. Davids. He had previously been connected with the Cathedral as a Prebendary, and, from 1898, as Chancellor and Canon Residentiary. Dean Smith was twice married and had two sons and one daughter.

30. The Dowager Lady Hillingdon was 88 years of age. She was Lady Louisa Isabella Lascelles, daughter of the third Earl of Harewood, and she married in 1863, Sir Charles Mills, Bart., who was raised to the peerage as first Baron Hillingdon in 1886. He died in 1898.

— **Professor P. Hume Brown, LL.D., F.B.A.,** Professor of Ancient (Scottish) History in the University of Edinburgh, and Historiographer Royal for Scotland from 1908 until his death, was born in 1850. He was educated at various English and Scottish Schools and at Edinburgh University. In 1898 he became editor of the Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, and in 1918-14 he was Ford Lecturer at Oxford. He published several volumes of history and biography, including a life of John Knox.

DECEMBER.

1. Rear-Admiral the Hon. Walter George Stopford was 63 years of age. He was the youngest son of the fourth Earl of Courtown, and became a Lieutenant in 1879, Commander in 1892, Captain in 1898, Commodore (second class) in 1905, and Rear-Admiral (retired) in 1907. He served as Naval Adviser to the Inspector-General of Fortifications from 1898 to 1900, and was in command of the R.N. Barracks, Portsmouth, in 1906. In 1906-7 he was a Naval A.D.C. to the King. In 1893 Admiral Stopford married Florence Mary, daughter of the Hon. Loran E. Baker, M.L.C., of Yarmouth, Nova Scotia.

2. Edmond Rostand, the French dramatist and poet, was born at Marseilles in 1868. At the age of 20 a vaudeville from his pen, "Le Gant Rouge," was produced at the Théâtre Cluny, and was a failure. In 1890 he published a volume of poems, "Les Musardises," and he came into touch with the Comédie Française through Ferandy the actor. He was encouraged to write something for that famous house, and in 1894 "Les Romanesques" was produced. In many quarters this met with an enthusiastic reception. Rostand's romantic work, which stood in such contrast to the universal realism of the day, seemed to embody the real Gallic spirit, with its chivalry and light-hearted heroism, and to a large

section of the French public Rostand became a national hero. "La Princesse Lointaine" and "Cyrano de Bergerac" in 1897, and "L'Aiglon" in 1900, all satisfied this side of the national character, and while his many enemies, including the whole of the left bank of the Seine, called him a mountebank, his friends acclaimed him as the one great poet of France. In reality there was truth in both these views, and Rostand's undoubted genius was strangely allied with a triviality and bad taste too constantly in evidence to be regarded merely as the occasional lapses of a great mind. In 1903 Rostand entered the Academy, and soon afterwards he went to live in Provence, where for seven years he was engaged on the task of writing "Chanticleer." The furore of excitement which the production of the play caused in Paris in 1910 showed the hold which its author had gained on the popular imagination. "Chanticleer" was a superb spectacle, and contained marvellous versification, but the dramatic interest was not well maintained, and the later acts became somewhat wearisome. Nevertheless the play had an overwhelming success, and established Rostand's reputation as a great romantic, both in his own country and abroad. After the outbreak of war he wrote chiefly patriotic verse which appeared in the columns of the newspapers, and he was latterly occupied with a "Faust," and a poem,

"La Marseillaise," which was to be recited in honour of the victorious armies on their return to France.

2. **John Griffiths**, who was born in 1837 of Welsh stock, was educated at the National Art Training School, known afterwards as the Royal College of Art, and until 1865 he was engaged on the decorative work of the South Kensington Museum. He then became the first Principal of the Bombay School of Art, where he had as his co-adjutor Mr. Lockwood Kipling, who had been appointed architectural sculptor, and the two worked together in harmony for ten years. After his friend's departure for Lahore Mr. Griffiths continued to enlarge the work of the school, which he left in a flourishing condition when he retired. He reproduced many of the famous paintings in the rock-cut temples of Ajanta, and wrote technical descriptions and criticisms of them in a work entitled "The Paintings in the Bhudhist Cave Temples of Ajanta." He designed a cenotaph in the Indo-Saracenic style in white marble for the Maharaja of Bharnagar, and also the carved wooden screen in the Bombay Court. Some of Mr. Griffiths' copies of the Ajanta paintings were published in two volumes in 1896-97 by order of the Secretary of State.

3. **The Right Rev. John Percival, D.D.**, late Bishop of Hereford, was born in 1834, and was a member of a Westmoreland yeoman family. He was educated at Appleby Grammar School, and from there he went as a Taberdar to Queen's College, Oxford, where he won the Junior Mathematical Scholarship in 1855. He took a double first in Moderations in 1856, a double first in Final Schools in 1858, and the same year he was elected Fellow of Queen's. On the title of his Fellowship he was ordained deacon in 1860 and priest in 1861, having joined the staff of Rugby School in the first of these years. In 1863 he went to Clifton as the first Head Master, and to the creation of this school he gave his great powers of organisation, and the full force of his moral influence for fifteen years. During his rule there he became a Prebendary of Exeter Cathedral, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop, Dr. Temple. In 1878 Dr. Percival was elected President of Trinity College, Oxford. To go from a new institution, in the forming of which he had been the great power, to one of long-established traditions, was a great change; but the College pros-

pered during his reign and its buildings were enlarged. He had previously been interested in the higher education of women, and he now became first President of the Council of Somerville Hall. In 1882 he was appointed to a residentiary canonry in Bristol Cathedral. The Headmastership of Rugby was offered to and accepted by him in 1887. Here his pronounced Liberal views on politics came into prominence with his support of the Welsh Disestablishment Bill, introduced by Mr. Asquith. His appointment to the See of Hereford in 1895 followed, and while it might be said with truth that the new Bishop's opinions were much disliked in that diocese, he, personally, was greatly liked. He was a keen sportsman in a rural country, and always courteous and kind to those, and they were many, from whose opinions he differed, and his interest in all public affairs was wide. He supported the University Extension movement, fraternised with Nonconformists, and, though he associated himself with the campaigns of Liberal Governments against the Welsh Church, he did much to make Mr. W. G. C. Gladstone's proposal for the commutation of existing interests a part of the Act. Dr. Percival married first Louisa, daughter of Mr. James Holland, and secondly, Mary Georgina, daughter of Dr. Symonds of Oxford. He left a family by his first marriage.

4. **Augustus Charles Lennox Fitzroy, seventh Duke of Grafton, K.G., C.B.**, was in his 97th year. He was the second son of the fifth duke, his mother being a daughter of Admiral the Hon. Sir George Cranfield Berkeley, G.C.B. He was educated at Harrow, and entered the 60th Rifles in 1837. Two years later he exchanged into the Coldstream Guards, becoming Colonel in 1862, Major-General in 1875, Lieut.-General in 1880, and he retired with the rank of General in 1881. He served in the Crimean War, was severely wounded at Inkerman, and was awarded the medal with three clasps, the Turkish and Sardinian medals, and the 5th Class of the Medjidieh. For thirty-three years the Duke was Equerry to Queen Victoria, who bestowed on him the Order of the Garter as a mark of her personal esteem; he had always kept free of party strife, and thus it was made clear on this occasion that the honour was non-political. The Duke succeeded his brother in 1882, and he interested himself greatly in the

administrative work in the counties of Northamptonshire, Buckinghamshire, and Suffolk. He was also a liberal benefactor of many charitable works, particularly the Grafton Institute for the improvement of the lot of poor boys in Northampton. He married, in 1847, Anna, daughter of Mr. James Balfour of Whittinghame. His wife and four of their five children predeceased him, and his successor was his second son, Lord Alfred William Maitland Fitzroy, who took the courtesy title of Earl of Euston on the death of his elder brother in 1912. The late Duke was Equerry to King Edward VII. (at whose Coronation he bore Curtana, the Sword of Mercy), and to King George V.

6. **Cecil Chesterton**, who died in Boulogne after an illness contracted after exposure in the trenches, was 39 years of age. He was educated at St. Paul's School, and in 1901 began his career as a journalist. He was connected with the *Outlook*, and wrote for many magazines and journals. In 1911 he became Assistant Editor, and in 1912 Editor of the *Eye Witness*, and in the latter year he founded the *New Witness*, which he also edited until in 1916 he joined the Army as a private in the Highland Light Infantry. Mr. Chesterton was at one time an ardent Fabian Socialist and served on the executive of the Fabian Society; but he abandoned these opinions, and from 1910 he vigorously attacked the party system. He came prominently before the public in 1912 as the assailant of the Marconi contract. He published several volumes on politics and kindred subjects, and married, in 1917, the writer whose pen-name is "John K. Prothero."

7. **Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke, Bart.**, was born in 1874, and succeeded his father, the well-known M.P., as third baronet in 1911. He was educated at Rugby and Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and he married, in 1915, the daughter of Henry M. Faithfull, M.A., of Sydney, N.S.W. He was succeeded by his cousin, Lieutenant F. W. Dilke, Royal Berkshire Regiment.

9. **Reginald Percy Cockin, M.D.**, was in his 40th year. He was educated at Caius College, Cambridge, where he graduated M.A. in 1906, and he took his M.D. in 1918. He joined the Colonial Service in 1908, and served in the Niger Cross River Expedition in that and the following years. After a period

in the Government Medical Service in Cyprus and in Grenada, he joined the staff of the London School of Tropical Medicine. He obtained a commission in the R.A.M.C. in 1915, but his health obliged him to return from Egypt where he went to investigate bilharziosis, and he resumed his work in London. He acted as Deputy Director of the School of Tropical Medicine during the absence of the Director on active service, and he inaugurated a special clinic at the Seamen's Hospital under the Local Government Board. He was a Fellow of the Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene.

9. **Frederick George Affalo** was born in 1870, and was well known as a traveller and a writer on many of the countries he had visited, on natural history, and particularly on fishing. In 1893 he founded the "British Sea Anglers' Society." He served with the Red Cross in Volhynia in 1916, and in 1917 he was appointed British Vice-Consul at Basle.

13. **Lord Edward Herbert Cecil**, Financial Adviser to the Egyptian Government, was the fourth son of the third Marquis of Salisbury, and was born in 1867. He was educated at Eton and joined the Grenadier Guards in 1887 and served for some time on the Irish Viceregal Staff. He took part in the Dongola Expedition in 1896, and was mentioned in dispatches and was awarded the British and the Khedive's medal. In 1897 he accompanied Sir Rennell Rodd's Mission to King Menelik of Abyssinia, and he served in the Egyptian Campaign of 1898, for which he was awarded the D.S.O. and was promoted Lieut.-Colonel. In the South African War he played a prominent part as Chief of Staff, and as A.A.G. in the defence of Mafeking, after which he was for a time Military Secretary to the Governor of the Sudan, Sir Reginald Wingate. Lord Edward became Agent-General of the Sudan, and Director of Intelligence to the Egyptian Army at Cairo in 1904; and in 1906 he was appointed Under-Secretary of State for War to the Egyptian Government, and (in the same year) Under-Secretary of State for Finance, jointly with Mr. Mitchell-Innes, on whose retirement, the next year, he became sole Under-Secretary for Finance. In 1912 he received the appointment of Financial Adviser to the Government, in which post he died. Lord Edward was a man who combined conspicuous ability with an unsparring devotion of himself to the service of

his country, and his tact and firmness enabled him to deal most satisfactorily with the difficult situation created by the establishment of a Protectorate in Egypt during the war. He married a daughter of the late Admiral Maxse, by whom he had two children. His only son was killed in France in 1914.

15. **Lady Edeline Strickland** was the daughter of the seventh Earl De La Warr. She was a Lady of Grace of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, and married Sir Gerald Strickland in 1890. She had five daughters.

18. **Sir Alfred Scott Scott-Gatty, K.C.V.O., Garter King of Arms**, was born in 1847, and was the son of the Rev. Dr. Alfred Gatty, Vicar of Ecclesfield and Sub-Dean of York. He was educated at Marlborough and at Christ's College, Cambridge, but he came down without taking a degree. In 1880 he entered the Heralds' College as Rouge-Dragon Pursuivant-of-Arms at the nomination of the Duke of Norfolk, and in 1886 he became York Herald. He acted as Registrar of the college from 1899 to 1904, when he was appointed Garter Principal King-of-Arms by Letters Patent of the Crown. He was a Knight of Justice of the English Order of St. John of Jerusalem, and Genealogist of the Order. He was a painstaking herald and genealogist, and made many gifts to the Heralds' College of his own manuscript copies of parish registers. On great ceremonial occasions Sir Alfred was an impressive figure, and used his fine voice to perfection when making proclamations. He was a well-known amateur musician, and a song writer of some distinction. In 1874 he married Miss Elizabeth Foster, by whom he had two sons. He was a brother of Mrs. Ewing, the author.

19. **Lady Charles Paulet** was in her 90th year, and was the daughter of Bernard Granville of Wellesbourne Hall, Co. Warwick, a direct descendant of Admiral Sir Richard Grenville of *Revenge* fame. She became, in 1850, the second wife of the Rev. Lord Charles Paulet, second son of the thirteenth Marquess of Winchester, and Vicar of Wellesbourne. She had three children, and was a woman of great beauty and wielded much good influence on those about her.

20. **Sir Frederick Alexander Robertson, K.B.E., LL.D.**, who was 64 years of age, was a Scotchman.

He was educated at King's College, London, and passed into the Indian Civil Service in 1874. He was at first Settlement Officer, and later Director of Land Records and Agriculture in the Punjab, and he was called to the Bar in 1887 when at home on leave. In 1896 he was made a Divisional Judge in the Punjab, and was sent in 1902 to the chief court of the Province. Two years later he was confirmed as a puisne Judge. In 1909-10 he was Vice-Chancellor of the Punjab University, and he was knighted before he retired in 1913, being awarded the K.B.E. in 1918. Sir Frederick settled in London after his retirement and took a great interest in the welfare of Indian students. He was Lecturer in Hindu and Mahomedan Law for the Council of Legal Education, and was also Lecturer in Mahomedan Law at the Imperial Institute. He assisted in forming the Indian Gymkhana Club, of which he was chairman, and as a member of the M.C.C. he arranged cricket matches between Indian and British khaki clubs. He published a volume, "Customary Law and Gazetteer" of the Rawal Pindi District. Sir Frederick was twice married.

21. **Harvey du Cros**, the founder of the pneumatic tyre industry, was born in 1846, and was of Huguenot descent. He represented Hastings as a Unionist in the House of Commons from 1906 to 1908, and was succeeded as member by his son Sir Arthur du Cros. He was a Chevalier of the Legion of Honour, a Knight of the Order of Isabella the Catholic, and a J.P. for Sussex.

22. **C. E. Perugini**, the well-known artist, was born in Naples in 1839. His parents resided customarily in England, and he was subsequently naturalised in this country. He studied art in Italy under Bonolis and Mancinelli, and entered later the studio of Ary Scheffer in Paris. He exhibited for many years in the London Royal Academy where his work attracted many admirers. He inherited the traditions of purity, correct draughtsmanship, refinement, and dignity, and delicacy of colour which mark the art of Raphael and Carlo Dolci. Mr. Perugini was the intimate friend of Leighton and Millais, and he married Kate, daughter of Charles Dickens. Some of his best-known pictures are "Dolce far Niente," "Fresh Lavender," "Flower Warship," and "The World Forgetting."

23. Walter Hines Page, late American Ambassador in London, was a Southerner and was a journalist by profession. He was editor of the *Atlantic Monthly* and the *Forum*, and he eventually founded the *World's Work*, a journal of remarkably discriminating power which recorded all sides and phases of human activity. Mr. Page had a deep knowledge of the ways and needs of his fellow-countrymen, and a progressive mind which sought to make of journalism a unifying and civilising influence. He was a member of Mr. Rockefeller's Southern Education Board, and served on Mr. Roosevelt's Country Life Commission and other similar agencies, and he was a member of the great publishing firm of Doubleday, Page & Co. In 1913, when he was in his 59th year, Mr. Page was appointed Ambassador to the Court of St. James's. He became at once very popular in London, and after the war broke out in 1914 he held his difficult position with great dignity and tact. During the period of American neutrality his loyalty to his own Government was combined with a sincere faith in the justice of the Allied cause, and a strong sense of the underlying unity of aims between the American and British peoples. This outlook helped him to steer the wise course through many rapids during the first two years of the war, and when America entered the lists as a combatant he at once delivered his mind of its true sentiments in many public speeches. His great aim was to bring about the best possible understanding between his country and Great Britain, and his retirement in August, 1918, owing to ill-health, was deeply regretted on both sides of the Atlantic.

— **Leonard George Guthrie, M.D.,** was born in 1858, and was educated at King's College, London, and Magdalen College, Oxford, where he matriculated in 1877. He became a student at St. Bartholomew's Hospital and interested himself particularly in nervous diseases, especially those of children. He was Secretary of the Committee which in the autumn before his death issued the Nomenclature of Diseases, and he was a member of the Board of Medical Assessors. He was Secretary and Vice-President of the Section of Medical History at the Royal Society of Medicine, President of the Harveian Society of London in 1913 to 1914, and he delivered the Fitzpatrick Lectures

at the Royal College of Physicians in 1907 to 1908.

24. William Thomas Freeman, M.D., F.R.C.S., who had practised for twenty years in Reading, had previously been Medical Officer of Bradfield College. He was a Lieut.-Colonel in the R.A.M.C., and had been Medical Officer at No. 8 Southern General Hospital, and subsequently on the staffs of No. 1 War Hospital, Reading, and the Royal Berkshire Hospital, and was in charge of Redlands War Hospital.

25. Charles Agar Bampfylde, F.R.G.S., was 62 years of age. He was the son of the late Major F. J. Bampfylde and was educated at Sidney College, Bath, and in the training-ship *Worcester*. In 1875 he joined the Sarawak Civil Service, which he left to work under the Government of British North Borneo in 1882. He re-entered Rajah Brooke's service two years later, and in 1885 he was appointed Acting Resident of Sarawak Proper. After this he held the highest appointments in that State, and administered the Government of the country during the Rajah's absence on three occasions. After his retirement, Mr. Bampfylde became political agent for the Sarawak Government in England, and, in 1912, a member of the State Advisory Council. Although he suffered from partial blindness he translated a mass of documents from the Malay into English, and, in conjunction with the Rev. S. Baring-Gould, he published in 1909, "A History of Sarawak under its Two White Rajahs."

26. Hallyburton George Campbell, third Baron Stratheden and Campbell, was in his 90th year. He was the son of the first Baron and Mary, Baroness Stratheden, and he entered the Bengal Civil Service in 18.9. He was Associate to the Lord Chief Justice, was Secretary of Commissions in the Court of Chancery from 1860 to 1873, and was Master of the Supreme Court of Judicature. His wife was the daughter of the late Right Hon. A. J. B. and Lady Mildred Beresford Hope, and his successor was his grandson, Alastair Campbell, the child of his son, Captain the Hon. J. B. Campbell, D.S.O. (who was killed in action in 1915), who married the Hon. Alice Susan Hamilton, daughter of the first Baron Hamilton of Dalzell.

26. Eveleen, Baroness Gray, whose age was 77, was the daughter of Captain Lonsdale Pounden and Lady Jane, daughter of the Earl of Moray, who was also Baron Gray. She married James MacLaren Smith in 1863; he assumed the name of Gray in 1897, and died in 1900. On the death of her uncle, George, then Earl of Moray, and nineteenth Baron Gray, in 1895, she succeeded him as the twentieth holder of the Scottish Barony. Her successor was her son the Hon. James MacLaren Stuart Gray, Master of Gray, M.A., F.R.G.S., F.R.S.L., F.R.S.E., formerly Captain in the 5th Battalion Rifle Brigade (Militia), who was born in 1864.

— **Sir Richard Charles Oldfield** was 90 years of age. He was the eldest son of Henry Swann Oldfield, and was educated at Eton and Haileybury. He entered the Bengal Civil Service in 1848, served in the Mutiny, and was wounded near Agra. He became a Judge of the High Court of Judicature, Allahabad, in 1873, and held that position until 1887. In 1854 he married Maria, daughter of Major Angelo, and had six children.

27. Lady Victoria Brady, the wife of Mr. James Cox Brady of New York, and only daughter of the Earl and Countess of Limerick, was 25 years of age. She was said to have been the second woman to loop the loop, which she did with M. Gustav Hamel. She was married in 1914.

— **Edward Cunliffe - Owen, C.M.G.,** was 61 years of age. He was the only child of the late Colonel Henry Cunliffe-Owen, R.E., and was educated at Wellington and Trinity Hall, Cambridge. He was called to the Bar by the Inner Temple in 1880, and became Secretary to the Metropolitan Electric Supply Company. He also acted as Secretary to several of the early Exhibitions in London held at Earl's Court. In 1882 he married Emma, daughter of the late Sir Philip Cunliffe-Owen, K.C.B.

28. The Right Rev. Alfred Earle, D.D., formerly Bishop of Marlborough, and, until within a few months of his death, Dean of Exeter, was born in 1828. He was the son of the late Mr. Henry Earle, F.R.S., Surgeon Extraordinary to Queen Victoria. He was educated at Eton, and won a Lusby Scholarship at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, where he took his degree in 1854. He then studied at Wells Theological

College, and was ordained Deacon in 1853 and Priest in 1859. He was curate at St. Edmund's, Salisbury, until 1863, when he became Rector of Monkton Raileigh, Wiltshire. In 1865 he was appointed to the joint Vicarages of West Alvington, South Milton, Marlborough, and Huish, Devon. The two latter being separated from Alvington in 1872, Mr. Earle held it alone for another sixteen years. He vigorously opposed the nomination of Dr. Temple to the See of Exeter in 1869, but personal acquaintance with that prelate soon aroused his respect and admiration. In 1872 he became a Prebendary of the Cathedral and Archdeacon of Totnes. In 1886 he was made a Canon Residentiary, and in 1888 Bishop Temple, then the occupant at the See of London, finding himself in need of a Suffragan for the western end of the diocese, recommended his old friend, Archdeacon Earle, for the appointment. As Bishop of Marlborough, Dr. Earle proved a loyal and untiring worker. He lived in Kensington until 1896, when the living of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, becoming vacant, it was made the appanage of the West London suffraganship. The amount of travelling thus necessitated proved too much for the Bishop's health, and in 1900 he retired to Exeter, becoming Dean of his old Cathedral. His health improved and he performed the duties entailed upon him with energy and great pleasure to himself until in July, 1918, the weight of years caused him to retire to Torquay where he passed away. Dr. Earle married, in 1866, Miss Ilbert of Bowringsleigh, Devon, and had a family. His wife died in 1911.

28. Henry De Vere Vane, ninth Baron Barnard, was the eldest son of Sir Henry Morgan Vane, and was born in 1854. He was educated at Eton and Brasenose College, Oxford, where he took his degree in 1876, and in 1879 he was called to the Bar by the Inner Temple. He received an appointment on the staff of the Charity Commission two years later, and there showed his aptitude for business and his industry. In 1892 he succeeded his distant kinsman, the Duke of Cleveland, as Baron Barnard, the only one of the Duke's titles which did not become extinct. Mr. Vane proved his claim to the barony by his descent from the second Baron who died in 1753, and thus became the owner of Raby Castle and estates. He devoted himself to public work, becoming Chairman of the Agricultural Department of Armstrong College, to which he rendered great

services, Chairman of a Sub-Committee appointed by the Board of Agriculture for the systematising of agricultural higher education, and a member (subsequently Chairman) of the Central Associated Chambers. He was a devoted Churchman and laboured in the cause of Church extension, becoming Chairman of the Archbishops' Committee on Church Finance, which reported in 1911. He married Lady Catherine Sarah Cecil in 1881, and was succeeded by his second son, Captain the Hon. Christopher William Vane, M.C., Cumberland and Westmorland Yeomanry, who was born in 1898. Lord Barnard's eldest son died in France in 1917.

28. Sir Joseph Baxter Ellis, first Lord Mayor of Newcastle, was 76 years of age. He was born near Leeds, and came to Tyneside when a child. He entered the business of his uncle, Mr. John Hindhough, corn merchant, miller, and seedsman, and became a partner before he was 25. He was a member for thirty-eight years of the Newcastle City Council, and was knighted in 1906 on the occasion of a visit of the King and Queen. He represented the Corporation on the Tyne Improvement Committee for over twenty-five years, and gave much thought to the enlarging of parks and public spaces. He was twice married and left a widow, and a family by both marriages.

— **Sir Charles Ernest Tritton, Bart.**, was born in 1845 and was educated at Rugby and Trinity Hall, Cambridge. He was senior partner of Brightwen & Co., bill brokers and banking agents, and from 1892 to 1900 he represented the Norwood Division of Lambeth as a Conservative in the House of Commons. Sir Charles was Vice-Chairman of the Hospital Sunday Fund and was connected with many other charitable associations. He married Miss Edith Green in 1872, and in 1905 received the honour of a baronetcy, to which his son, Alfred Ernest, succeeded.

29. Sir William Bartlett Dalby, Consulting Aural Surgeon to St. George's Hospital, was born in 1840, and was educated at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge. In 1894-95 he was President of the Medical Society, and he was also President of the Otological Society of the United Kingdom. He published lectures and articles on diseases of the ear. He

was married, in 1878, to Miss Hyacinthe Wellesley, and was knighted in 1886. He had four children.

31. Captain William Leefe Robinson, V.C., the first airman to bring down a Zeppelin in England, was born in India in 1895, and was the son of Mr. Horace Robinson. He was educated at St. Bees School, Cumberland, and entered Sandhurst in August, 1914. He was gazetted to the Worcestershire Regiment the following December, and joined the Royal Flying Corps in France in March, 1915, as an observer. He was wounded, and after his recovery learnt to fly at Farnborough. He was then attached to various stations in England for night flying, and on September 3, 1916, brought down a Zeppelin over Cuffley, for which exploit he received the V.C. On returning later to France, he was taken prisoner by the Germans, who, after he had made several attempts to escape, placed him in solitary confinement in a small cell. He was repatriated on December 14, 1918, and was suffering from the effects of his captivity when he succumbed to influenza after a week's illness.

— **Major Sir John Eugene Clanson, K.C.M.G., C.V.O.**, was born in 1866. He was educated at the Merchant Taylors' School, at Clifton College, and at Woolwich, and received his commission to the Royal Engineers in 1885. In 1889 he designed the Army Pontoon which was still in use when he died. He passed the Staff College (first place) in 1893, and, having graduated B.A., London, with honours in 1887, was admitted by the Inner Temple ten years later. From 1895 to 1900 he held various appointments on the Army Headquarters Staff, and from 1900 to 1906 he was Secretary of the Colonial Defence Committee. From 1905 to 1910 he was Chief Secretary to the Government of Cyprus, and from 1910 to 1914 Lieut.-Governor of Malta. He returned to Cyprus in August, 1914, as High Commissioner and Commander-in-Chief, and succeeded in maintaining perfect order in the island when it was passing through difficult times, being first annexed by Great Britain, and then momentarily offered to Greece. Sir John was appointed C.M.G. in 1904, C.V.O. in 1912, and K.C.M.G. in 1918. His wife, to whom he was married in 1890, was Mary Elizabeth, daughter of Sir William Makins, Bart., and he left three sons.

INDEX.

The figures between [] refer to PART I.

[*Speeches in Parliament are entered under their subjects under the heading "Parliamentary Speeches," and those outside Parliament under the speaker's name.*]

ABINGDON, W. L., Obit., 179
 ABRAHAM, L. B., Obit., 180
 ABYSSINIA, Taitou, Dow. Empress of, Obit., 165
 ACCIDENTS.—Explosion, Courneuve, 5; London, 5; Midlands, Shell-filling factory, 12; Podmore Hall Colliery, [48]
 AFGHANISTAN, [266]
 AFLALO, F. G., Obit., 210
 AFRICA, EAST. — ABYSSINIA, [285]. BRITISH EAST AFRICA, [283]; Northey, Major-G.-n. E., appointed Governor, [284], 11. GERMAN EAST AFRICA, German force surrenders, [283], 20. PORTUGUESE EAST AFRICA, Amorius, Col. M., appointed Governor-General, [283].
 — NORTH.—MOROCCO, [285]
 — SOUTH.—BUDGET, [279]; the Railway, [279]. CAPE TOWN University, [279]; Census, [280]. INFLUENZA epidemic [281]. LEGISLATIVE measures, [279]. RHODESIA, Chaplin, Sir D., Administrator, opens the Legislative Council, [282]; Unalienated Lands, case of, [281]. STELLENBOSCH University, [280]. UNREST, condition of, [280]. WAR casualties, [281]
 — SOUTH-WEST, Colony of, [281]
 — WEST.—BELGIAN CONGO, [284]. LIBERIA, Monrovia bombarded, [284]. NIGERIA, [284]
 AIR Council, established, 1; appointment of members, 3, 4
 — Force, decorations and medals, 10
 — raids, BRITISH, Cologne, 9, 15; Durazzo, 9; Frankfort, 15; Karlsruhe, [20], 14; Mannheim, 15; Tondern, [44]; Treves, 15. GERMAN, East Coast, 5, 6; Essex, [20], 2; Hartlepool, [20]; Kent, [20]; London, [20], [44], [43], [104], [105], 2, 4, 5, 9; Midlands, [105]; Paris, 5; Yorkshire, [105], 5; attacked by the Royal Air Force, 14
 ALBANIA, [246]. DURAZZO occupied, [38]
 ALBERT Hall, meeting at, [157]
 — H. R. H. Prince, at Paris, 20
 ALEXANDER, Sir G., Obit., 73, 170
 ALHUSEN, Mrs., Obit., 188

ALIEN Peril, report on, [110]; members of the Advisory Committee, [114]; work of the, [140]; internments, [141]; Watch Committee formed, [115]
 ALLAN, M., libel action against, [105], 10
 ALLEN, G., & Unwin, publication of "War and Revolution in Asiatic Russia," 30
 — Dr. H. P., Director of the Royal College of Music, 75
 AMERICA.—*Vide* Canada, Mexico, Newfoundland, United States
 — CENTRAL.—GUATEMALA, Cabrera, President E., address to the Legislature, [312]. NICARAGUA, Germany, war declared against, 8
 — SOUTH. — ARGENTINA, cattle, export, [310]. Congress, opened, [310]. Elections, [310]. Meat, shortage, [310]. Strikes, [310]. BOLIVIA, Peru, treaty with, [312]. BRAZIL, Alves, Senhor R., elected President, [308]. Braz, Dr. W., opens Congress, [308]. Bunsen, Sir M., head of the British mission, [309]. Election, Presidential, [308]. Embassy, rank of, [309], 16. Ministers, the new, [309]. Paget, Sir R. S., appointed Ambassador, 16. CHILI, Election, General, [311]. Ministers, the new, [311]. Peru, relations with, [311]. Sanfuentes, Senor, address to Congress, [311]. COLUMBIA, Suarez, Dr. M. F., elected President, [312]. PERU, Arica and Tacna question, [311]. Bolivia, treaty with, [312]. Chili, relations with, [311]. Great Britain, relations with, [309]. Pardo, President, address to Congress, [311]. URUGUAY, Constitution, the new, [312]
 "AMERICAN Literature, A History of," 36
 ANDERSON, Sir J., Obit., 173
 ANDERSON, Sir R., Obit., 204
 ANHALT, Duke Friedrich II. of, Obit., 175
 ANTRIM, Earl of, Obit., 186
 ARMISTICE, terms, [44]-[46], [149], 149-158; renewed, 21
 ARMSTRONG, Sir W., Obit., 187
 ARMY, British, military operations on the Western Front, [21]-[26]; forced to retreat, [22], [29]; defence of

- Amiens, [23]-[25]; reinforcements, [25]; Battle of Armentières, [26]; Order to the troops, [27]; number of prisoners and guns captured, [34], [35], 17; cross the German frontier, 21; in Cologne, [46], 21
- ARMY, Demobilisation, [165]
- Education, co-ordinated, [143]
- Generals, promotion of, 6
- Officers, increase of pay, 2
- ARMYTAGE, Sir G. J., Obit., 202
- ART.—Retrospect of: GROSVENOR Gallery, exhibition, 69. INDUSTRIAL Art, British Institute of, 70. LINNELL Collection, sale of, 71. NATIONAL Gallery, trustees, 71. NAVAL pictures, 69. POYNTER, Sir E., President of the Royal Academy, resignation, 70. SALES, 71. WALLACE Collection, trustees, 70. WAR pictures, 69
- ASHFORD, C. E., appointed adviser on education to the Board of Admiralty, 17
- ASQUITH, Brig.-Gen. A. N., appointed Controller of the Trench Warfare Department, 7
- Rt. Hon. H. H., at Lincoln, [163]
- W. W., Obit., 202
- ASTOR, Major the Hon. W., appointed Secretary to the Ministry of Food, [121], 13
- ATKIN, Hon. Mr. Justice, Chairman of the Committee on the wages of women and men, 15
- AUSTRALIA. — BUDGET, Federal, [316]. CONSCRIPTION policy, defeat of, [313]. Cook, J., in London, [316], 11. ELECTION, General, [313]. HUGHES, W. M., resignation, [314]; reassumes office, [314]; in London, [316], 11. LABOUR Party, manifesto, [313]; Conferences, [316], [317]; Loans, issue of [316]. MELBOURNE, Conference at, [315]. NATIONALIST Party, policy, [313]. New South Wales, Labour Conference, [316]. PERTH, Labour Conference, [317]. QUEENSLAND, Election, General, [318]. RECRUITS, voluntary, [315]. Ryan, Mr., on the powers of the State Legislatures, [317]. STATE Legislatures, powers, [316], [317]. WAR, casualties, [318]. Watt, Mr., Acting Prime Minister, [316]
- SOUTH.—ELECTION, General, [318]
- AUSTRIA-HUNGARY. — ANDRASSY, Count, Foreign Minister, [219]; note, [219]. Armistice terms, 151-153; signed, [36], 19. BREST-LITOVSK, peace negotiations, [4]-[9]. Burian, Baron, Foreign Minister, [216], 7; on negotiations for peace, [218]; resignation, [219]. CZECHO-SLOVAKS, independence, [217], [219], 14. Czernin, Count, Foreign Minister, [213]; negotiations of peace, [5], [213]-[215], controversy with M. Clemenceau, [215]; resignation, [216], 7. DURAZZO, capture of, 18. FIUME, mutiny at, [220]. Food-shortage, [215]. GERMAN-AUSTRIA, State of, [220]; condition, [223]. HUNGARY, appointment of Ministers, [221]. Hussarek, Baron von, Premier, [216]; on the Polish question, [218]; resignation, [220]. ITALY, military operations against, [30], [36], [220]. JUGO-SLAVS, independence, [219], [222]. KAROLYI, Count, Premier of Hungary, [220]. LAMMASCH Prof., Premier, [220]; resignation, [222]. Nationalities, attitude to the war, [213]; discontent, [216]. PEACE negotiations, [213], [217], [295], [298]-[301], 16, 19. SEIDLER, Dr. von, Premier, resignation, [216]. Seitz, Herr, President of the German-Austrian State Council, [221]. TISZA, Count, murdered, [221]. Trieste, entered, [6], 19. UKRAINIA, peace with, [9], [214], [215], 3. VIENNA, condition, [223]
- AUSTRIA-HUNGARY. — Charles, Emperor of, meeting with the Emperor of Germany, 8; policy, [212]; manifesto, [218]; abdication, [221], 20
- BACKHOUSE, Sir J. E., Obit., 186
- BACON, Vice-Adm. Sir R. H. S., appointed Controller of the Munitions Inventions Department, 2
- BALL, S., Obit., 180
- BALTIC Provinces, [239]
- BAMFFYLDE, C. A., Obit., 212
- BANCROFT, H. H., Obit., 167
- BANK of England, Nairne, Sir G., appointed Comptroller, 8, 79
- rate, 78
- BANKS, amalgamation, [55], [127], 80; report on, [101], 5, 80
- BARCLAY, Sir D. E. D., Obit., 194
- BARCLAY's and the London Provincial and South-Western Banks, amalgamation, [127], 12, 80
- BARLEY, price of, 15
- BARNARD, Baron, Obit., 213
- BARNES, Rt. Hon. G. N., at Glasgow, [163]
- BARONETRIES conferred, Barton, Mr. Justice, 1; Butcher, J. G., 10; Calthorp, G., 10; Craig, J., 1; Griffith, E., 1; Harmsworth, L., 10; Smith, Sir F. E., 1
- BARRINGTON, Hon. Sir E., Obit., 167
- BARNOW, Sir R. V., Obit., 166
- BARRY, Sir J. W., Obit., 161
- BATHURST, Sir C., Chairman of the Sugar Commission, report, [93]
- BATTISCOMBE, Rear-Adm. A. H. W., Obit., 192
- BEALE, Sir J., appointed Chief Secretary to the Ministry of Food, 16
- BEAVERBROOK, Lord, appointed Minister in charge of Propaganda, 3; Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, 3; resignation, 18
- BELGIANS, Albert, King of the, reply to the Pope's Peace Note, [247]; re-enters Brussels, [247], 20
- BELGIUM.—ANTWERP, entered, 20. BRUGES evacuated, [35]. Brussels entered, [247], 20. COOREMAN, M., Prime Minister, 10. DELACHOIX, M., Prime Minister, [248]. Dixmude captured, [35], 17. "FLANDERS, Council of," elections, [247]. GERMAN troops leave, 20. Gillain, Lieut.-Gen., appointed Chief of the Staff, 7. MINISTRY, the new, [248]. NAMUR, occupied,

20. OSTEND, blocked, [41], 8; evacuated, [35], 18. PEACE Conference, claims, [248]. RUCQUOY, Lieut.-Gen., Chief of the Staff, resignation, 7. VROQUEVILLE, Baron de, Prime Minister, resignation, 10. ZEEBRUGGE, blocked, [41], 7, 8; occupied, 18
- BELL, A., Obit., 207
 BENNETT, A., "The Pretty Lady," 57
 BENNETT, J. G., Obit., 179
 BENNETT, W. H., Obit., 189
 BENNETT-GOLDNEY, Major F., Obit., 186
 BENSON, M., Obit., 182
 BERNERS, Baron, Obit., 190
 BEVAN, Rev. L., Obit., 188
 BIDDLE, Major-Gen. J., appointed an honorary K.C.B., 13
 BIDDULPH, Gen. Sir R., Obit., 205
 BILLING, N. P., trial, [105]; acquitted, 10
 BILLS.—AIR Force, [53]. ALIENS, British Nationality and Status, [112]. CORN Production, [53]. EDUCATION, [86], [86], [89], [115]. FINANCE, [31], [90], [96]. HEALTH, Ministry of, [147]. HOME Rule, [76]. HOUSING, [146]. LUXURY Tax, [147]. MAN-Power, [71]-[75]. METAL Industry, non-ferrous, [53]. MILITARY Service, [50], [71]-[75], 6, 7. PROPORTIONAL Representation, [86]. REFORM Act, [51]-[53]. TRADE Boards, [97]. TRADING with the Enemy, [114]. WOMEN members of Parliament, [145], 18
 BLYTHSWOOD, Major-Gen. Lord, Obit., 170
 BOITO, A., Obit., 181
 BOLO, Pasha, trial, [172], 3; executed, [173], 7
 BOOT, W. H. J., Obit., 190
 BORDEN, Sir R., Prime Minister of Canada, at the Imperial War Cabinet, [98], 10
 BOUGHEY, Col. G. F. O., Obit., 160
 BOULTON, Sir S. B., Obit., 175
 BOWDLER, Col. C. W. B., Obit., 202
 BOWN, Rev. G. H., Obit., 206
 BOYLE, W. L. Obit., 194
 BRACKENBURY, Adm. J. W., Obit. 170
 BRADY, Lady V., Obit., 213
 BRANCH, J., Obit., 205
 BRANCKER, Major-Gen. W. S., Master-General of Personnel of the Royal Air Force, 15
 BRASSEY, Earl, Obit., 166
 BRINS, Major C. W., appointed Director of Extensions of Merchant Shipping, 12
 BRITISH Army. *See* Army
 — Empire, Order of the, appointments, 2
 — Expeditionary Force, anniversary of the landing in France, 14
 — Museum for the Air Ministry, decision against, 2
 — Red Cross Society, amount of *The Times* fund, 7, 12, 22
 "BROOKE, Rupert, Collected Poems of," 45
 BROWN, Prof. P. H., Obit., 208
 BUCHANAN, Sir G., British Ambassador at Petrograd, return to England, 1
 BUCKINGHAM Palace, demonstrations on peace, [150]
 BULGARIA.—ARMISTICE, refused, 17; terms of, [243]; signed, [37]. BRITISH troops enter, 17. CAPITULATION, [37], 17. MALINOFF, M., Prime Minister, [243]. Military operations, [37]. PRILEP, captured, [37]. 16. RADOSLAVOFF, M., resignation, [243]. TODOROFF, M., Prime Minister, [244]
 BULGARIA.—BORIS, Crown Prince, succeeds to the throne, [244]; manifesto, [244]
 — Ferdinand, King of, abdication, [244], 18
 BUMPUS, J. B., Obit., 166
 BURTOHELL, Major-Gen. C. H., appointed Director-General of Medical Services, 9
 BUSINESS Men's Week campaign, [57], 4; amount raised, [58], 5
 BUTLER, Dr. H. M., Obit., 160
 BUTTER, rationing of, 4
- CALESBERG, Comte de P. de, Obit., 187
Calypso, H.M.S., captures Bolshevik destroyers, 22
 CAMBRIDGE University, Thomson, Sir J. J., appointed Master of Trinity College, 3
 CAMBRIDGE University Press, publication of "A History of American Literature," 36; "Memoir of John Michell," 38
 CAMPBELL, D. G., Obit., 184
 CAMPBELL, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H., appointed Lord Chancellor of Ireland, 10
 CAMPBELL, Gen. Sir W., Obit., 183
 CAMPERDOWN, Earl of, Obit., 180
 CANADA.—BORDEN, Sir R., in London, [306], 10. Budget, [306]. CONSCRIPTION Bill, [303]. ELECTION, General, [303]. Expenditure, [306]. HEREDITARY titles, views against, [305]. LEGISLATIVE measures, [305]. LOAN, issue of, [306]. MILITARY operations in France, [34], [36], [45]. PARLIAMENT, the new, opened, [305]. Prisoners and guns, capture of, [35]. QUEBEC, result of the Conscription Bill, [304]. WOMAN-Franchise Bill, [306]
 CAPES, B., Obit., 200
 CAPITAL and Counties, and Lloyds Banks, amalgamation, [127], 80
 CARLESS, J. H., awarded the V.C., 9
 CARPENTER, Rt. Rev. W. B., Obit., 198
 CARSON, Sir E., member of the War Cabinet, resignation, 2
 CARTER, A. H., Obit., 173
 CARTER, R. B., Obit., 197
 CARYSFORT, Countess of, Obit., 160
 CASSELL & Co., publication of "Dr. Muehlion's Diary," 31; "Joan and Peter," 58; "The Pretty Lady," 57
 CAUCASIA, [225], [240]
 CAUTLEY, E. H., appointed Director of Pig Production, 6
 CAVAN, Lord, in command of the troops in Italy, [36]
 CAVE, Sir G., appointed Lord of Appeal, 20
 CAVENDISH, Col. J. C., Obit., 184
 CECIL, Lord E. H., Obit., 210
 CECIL, Lord R., appointed Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, [121], 13; resignation, [162], 20
 CESARESCO, Count E. M., Obit., 203

CHAMBERLAIN, Rt. Hon. A., appointed member of the War Cabinet, [76], 7
 CHANCELLOR, C., Obit., 159
 CHESTERTON, C., Obit., 210
 CHILDS-PRIBERTON, Mrs., Obit., 204
 CHINA.—CIVIL WAR, [274]. FENG Kuo-Chang, President, [274]. Floods, [274]. Hsu Shih-Chang, President, [275]. JAPAN, relations with, [275], [276]. Li Yuan-Hung, President, controversy with Tuan-Chi-Jui, [273]; resignation, [274]. PARLIAMENT, the new, [275]. Plague epidemic, [274]. TUAN-CHI-JUI, Prime Minister, [274]. WANG Shih-Cheng, Prime Minister, [274]
 CHUBB, C. H. E., presents Stonehenge to the nation, 16
 CLANSON, Major Sir J. E., Obit., 214
 CLIFFORD, Sir H., "German Colonies: A Plea for the Native Races," 26
 CLOTHES, Standard, system of, [104]
 CLYNES, Rt. Hon. J. R., appointed Food Controller, [92], [121], 12; resignation, [162], 20
 COAL, consumption, reduction, [56], [128], [139], 12; conference, [140]; deficiency, amount of, [139], 14; rationing, [87]
 COCKIN, R. P., Obit., 210
 COINAGE, decimal, commission on, 15
 COLLINS & Sons, publication of "Foe-Farrell," 51; "Karen," 55; "Mrs. Bente," 54; "A Writer's Recollections," 38
 COLWYN, Lord, chairman of a committee on Bank Amalgamations, 6
 COMMERCE and Finance in 1918, 76-81
 COMMERCIAL Conference, London, 12
 COMPTON, E., Obit., 185
 CONNAUGHT, Princess Victoria Patricia of, betrothal, [167], 22
 CONSTABLE & Co., publication of "Air-fare of To-day and of the Future," 33; "Deductions from the World War," 34; "Gudrid the Fair," 53; "The Last of the Romanoffs," 33; "Remnants," 49; "Traditions of British Statesmanship," 35; "Trivia," 49
 CONYNGHAM, Capt. the Marq., Obit., 203
 CORNISH, Rt. Rev. J. R., Obit., 175
 COSSACK Republic, [225], [239]
 COTTESLOE, Baron, Obit., 174
 COTTON industry dispute, [166]; strike, [134], [166], 16, 21
 COTTON, J. S., Obit., 183
 COURTNEY, Baron, Obit., 177
 COZENS-HARDY, Lord, Master of the Rolls, resignation, 8
 CRAIG, F., Obit., 183
 CRAIG, Sir J., Treasurer of the Household, resignation, 11
 CRIMINAL CASES.—Billing, N. P., [105], 10; Smith, L., 4
 CROMIE, Capt. F., killed by Bolsheviks, [230], 15
 CROOKE, Capt. H. R., appointed Director of Naval Ordnance, 12
 CROS, H. du, Obit., 211
 CROWE, Brig.-Gen. J. H. V., "General Smuts' Campaign in East Africa," 27
 CUNLIFFE-OWEN, E., Obit., 213
 CUNNINGHAM, Hon. Lady, Obit., 183

CYPRUS, [264]

CZECHO-SLOVAK REPUBLIC.—INDEPENDENCE, [217], [219], 14. Irkutsk captured, [236]. KRAMARSH, Dr., Prime Minister, [222]. MARGARYK, Prof., elected President, [222], 20; takes the oath of loyalty, 21. Ministers, appointment of, [222]. NATIONAL Council, [219]

Daily Chronicle, sale of, [141], 18

— Mail, offer to the Labour Party, [165]

— News, results of the Election, [165]

DALBY, Sir W. B., Obit., 214

DALE, F. H., Obit., 201

DALLAS, Sir G., Obit., 207

DAVIES, J. H., "A Poet's Pilgrimage," 46

DAVIS, A. N., "The Kaiser I Knew," 30

— J., appointed American Ambassador in London, 16

DAWSON, W. J., "Robert Shenstone," 58

DEBUSST, C., Obit., 173

DECIMAL coinage, commission on, 15

DE MAULEY, Lord, Obit., 174

DEMobilisation of the Army, [165]

DENMARK.—ELECTION, General, [259].

ICELAND, relations with, [259]. RIGSDAG opened, [259]. SCHLESWIG question, [260]

DENT, J. M., & Sons, publication of "Paris Through an Attic," 46

DEPUTATIONS, received by, George, D. L., [125], [166]; Law, B., [125]; Smuts, General, [131]

DERBY, Lord, appointed Chairman of the National Salvage Council, 5; Ambassador in Paris, [76], 7

DILKE, Sir C. W., Obit., 210

DORRIEN-SMITH, T. A., Obit., 187

DOVER, raid on, 3

DOWNSHIRE, Marq. of, Obit., 180

DRAMA.—Comedies, 72. Plays, 71; new 72; war, 72. Reviews, 73. Shakespeare's plays, 72

DREYER, Capt. F. C., appointed Director of Naval Artillery, 12

DRUMMOND, Rev. Dr. J., Obit., 182

DUCKHAM, Sir A., appointed to superintend Aircraft production, 8

DUCKWORTH & Co., publication of "The Fire of Green Boughs," 55, "The Sheepfold," 56

DUFF, Gen. Sir B., Obit., 160

DUFFERIN and Ava, Marq. of, Obit., 163

DUFFIELD, W. B., Obit., 180

DUKE, Rt. Hon. H. E., appointed Lord Justice of the Court of Appeal, 8

DYKE, H. Van, "Fighting for Peace," 34

EADY, Rt. Hon. Sir C. S., appointed Master of the Rolls, 8

EARLE, Rt. Rev. A., Obit., 213

EBURY, Baron, Obit., 204

ECCLESIASTICAL.—BARNES, Rev. E. W., Canon of Westminster, 21. HENSON, Dr. H. H., Bishop of Hereford, 1. JAYNE, Dr., Bishop of Chester, resignation, 11. ST. MARGARET'S, Westminster, service at, [129], [151]. ST. PAUL'S Cathedral, service at, [106], [151]. SWAYNE, Rev. Prebendary W. S., Dean of Manchester, 11

EDMONDES, Rev. F. W., Obit., 203
 EDWARDS, Gen. Sir S. De B., Obit., 162
 EDWARDS, A. H., "Paris Through an Attic," 46
 EGYPT.—BUDGET, [285]. CENSUS, [287]. PALESTINE, Aleppo, occupied, [287], 19; Beyrout, captured, [287], 18; Damascus, occupied, [287], 17; military operations, [288], 16; Turks, surrender, [287], 17. SUDAN, [287]; Budget, [287]
 ELECTION, General, 20; preparations for, [144]; issue of writs, [155], 21; campaign, [156], [162]; manifesto, [158]-[162]; polling, [168], 21; result, [164], 22; women candidates, [163]
 ELECTIONS.—CAVAN, 11; Clapham, 11; Finsbury, East, [120], 12; Prestwich, 3; Tyrone, East, 6
 ELIOT, Sir C., appointed High Commissioner in Siberia, 14
 ELLINGTON, Major-Gen. E. L., Controller General of Equipment, 15
 ELLIOT, Hon. A. D., "Traditions of British Statesmanship," 35
 ELLIOT-COOPER, Lieut.-Col. N. B., Obit., 165
 ELLIS, Sir J. B., Obit., 214
 ELLISTON, G., Obit., 174
 EMMOTT, Lord, Chairman of the Commission on a decimal coinage, 15
 EMPIRE Day, celebration of, 9
 ENGINEERING and Allied Trades Council, Conference at Leeds, 13
 ENGINEERS, Amalgamated Society of, decision, 4
 ERICHSEN, N., Obit., 205
 ESTIMATES, Army, [60], [62]; Navy, [68]
 ETON, James, Dr. M. R., appointed Provost, 13
 EVANS, Sir L. W., appointed Financial Secretary to the Ministry of Munitions, 3; Minister of Blockade, [121], 13
 EVANS, Sir S. T., Obit., 191
 EXHIBITION, British Scientific Products, King's College, [149]
 EXPENDITURE, National, increase of, [53], 76
 EXPLOSIVE Trades Ltd., organisation, 80
 EXPORTS, value of, 79
 FAIRBANKS, C. W., Obit., 180
 FALMOUTH, Viscount, Obit., 194
 FARQUHARSON, R., Obit., 181
 FAY, Sir S., appointed Director-General of Movements and Railways, 5
 FIELDING, Sir C. W., appointed Director-General of Food Production, 13
 FIELDING, Major-General G. C. T., appointed to the London District Command, 15
 FINANCE and Commerce in 1918, 76-81
 FINLAND.—BOLSHEVIK revolt, outbreak, [237]. GERMAN troops land at Hangö, [238]. HELSINGFORS, evacuated, [238]. Hesse, Prince Frederick Charles of, chosen King, 13; election, [238], 18. MANNERHEIM, Gen., Regent, [238]. SVINKUFVUD, M., Regent, [238]; resignation, [238]. Sweden, appeal to, [237]
 FISHER, Lady, Obit., 186

FISHER, Rt. Hon. W. Hayes, President of the Local Government Board, resignation, 19
 FLAX, production of, [56]
 FLEET, the Grand, sinks German trawlers, 7
 FOCH, General, Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Armies in France, [28], 7, 13; counter-offensive, [31], [105]; reception in London, [167]. See France.
 FOOD Controllers, Allied, meeting in London, 13
 — rationing, [127]
 — supplies, [92], [140]; Conference in Paris, 6
 FORREST, Rev. D. W., Obit., 167
 FORRESTER, Lord, Obit., 189
 FOX, Sir C. E., Obit., 196
 FOX, Col. Sir G. M., Obit., 170
 FRANCE.—ALSACE-LORRAINE question, [170], [173], [177]; French troops enter, [177]. Armistice, terms, [176]. BAPAUME, captured, [33], 15. Bolo Pasha, tr al., [172], 3; execution, [173], 7. Budget, [175]. CAILLAUX, J., arrested, [172]. Cavallini, Signor, execution, [173], 3. Clemenceau, M., in London, [167]; Premier, [171]; on the defection of Russia, [175]; victories of the armies, [176]; policy, [179]; controversy with Count Czernin, [215]. DUAL Alliance with Russia, [176]. Dubail, Gen., appointed Grand Chancellor of the Legion of Honour, 11. Duval, trial, [174], 9; execution, 13. FOCH, Marshal, in command of the Allied armies, [28], 7; counter-offensive, [31], [105], 13; in London, [167]; entry into Strasburg, [177], 20; Order of Merit conferred, 20. GEORGE V., King, reception in Paris, [178]. Guillaumat, Gen., appointed military Governor of Paris, 11. LAON, captured, 18. Lille, captured, [35], 18. Le Catelet, captured, 17. MALVY, M., trial, [175]. Mauberge, captured, 19. Metz, entered, [177], 20. Military operations in Bulgaria, [37]; on the Western Front, [21], [28]-[36]. Mons, captured, [36], [45]. Montdidier, captured, [33]. NOYON, captured, 15. PARIS, bombardment, [24], 5. Passports to Petrograd, refusal, [171]. Peronne, captured, [23], [34], 15. PICHON, M., Foreign Secretary, [171]; on war aims, [172]; revelations on German policy, [173]; on the Alsace-Lorraine question, [178]. Poincaré, Pres., tour in Alsace and Lorraine, [177]. Prisoners, captured, [32], [33]. SAAR Valley, fate of, [178]. St. Quentin, captured, [35], 17. Sedan, entered, [35], 19. Socialist Party Congress, [178]; policy, [170]. Soissons, captured, 10, 14. TREASON, conspiracies, [172]-[175]. VALEN-CHENNES, entered, [35], 19. Victor Emmanuel, King, in Paris, [178]. WAR Loan, [175]. Wilson, Pres., at Brest, [178], 21
 FRANCE's Day, celebrated, [126]
 FRASER, Prof. N., Obit., 176
 FREEMAN, W. T., Obit., 212

- FRENCH**, Viscount, appointed Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, [87], 8; Proclamations, [87], [91]
- FREYTAG-LÖRINGHOVEN**, Lieut.-General Baron von, "Deductions from the World War," 34
- FRY**, Sir E., Obit., 197
- FUEL** and lighting order, for saving coal, 12
- GALLAGHER**, Sir W., appointed Commissioner of Customs and Excise, 6
- GALLOWAY**, Adm. A. A. C., Obit., 165
- GALSWORTHY**, J., "Five Tales," 49
- GAS**, rationing of, [57]
- GEARY**, Lieut.-Gen. Sir H. Le G., Obit., 186
- GEDDES**, Rt. Hon. Sir A., appointed President of the Local Government Board, 19
- Sir E., naval mission to Washington, 18; appointment on demobilisation, 21
- GEIKIE**, Sir A., "Memoir of John Michell," 38
- GEORGE V.**, King, anniversary of his wedding, [105]; at the Guildhall, [106]; reply to addresses, [107]-[109], [155]; with the troops in France, 8, 14; return to London, 6, 21; letter to *The Times*, 7; at the Albert Hall, 9; birthday honours, 10; receives members of the Imperial War Conference, [125]; at St. Margaret's, Westminster, [129]; rejoicings on peace, [150]; congratulatory messages, [151]; at St. Paul's Cathedral, [151]; addresses from the Houses of Parliament, [154]; confers the Order of Merit on Marshal Foch, 20; entertains Sir D. Haig, [168]; Pres. Wilson, [168], 22; at Paris, [178], 20
- GEORGE**, Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd, appeal to the nation, [47]; to farmers, [57], [102]; welcomes the Dominion Ministers, [99]; appeal to women, [102]; manifesto on the munition strike, [122]; on trade policy, [125]; message to the Empire, [129]; at Manchester, [135]; appeal to the cotton-spinners, [135]; at the Guildhall, [149]; on a Coalition Government, [156]; at the Central Hall, Westminster, [156]; election manifesto, [158]-[162]; address to women electors, [163]; statement of his policy, [163]; on industrial questions, [165]; at the Supreme War Council Meetings, 8, 10
- GERMANY**.—**ATR-RAIDS**, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9. Armistice terms, [44]-[46], [206], [208], 19, 153-158; signed, [36], [149], 19
- BERLIN**, return of the Prussian Guard, [211]. Bethmann-Hollweg, Herr von, Chancellor, resignation, [189]. Brest-Litovsk, treaty, [4]-[9], [194]. British Army cross the frontier, 21. Constitution, Bill for altering Clause XI, [204]. **DEMOCRATIC** movement, [186]; ideal, [187]. **EBERT**, Herr, Chancellor, [208], 19. Eichhorn, Marshal von, assassinated, [233], 13. **FINANCE**, [196]. Finland, Treaty of Peace with, [195]. Fleet, mutiny, [207]. Food, shortage, [199]. **HAMBURG**, strike, [192], [207]. Helfferich, Dr., Ambassador at Moscow, 13; resignation, 16. Hertling, Count, Chancellor, [189]; on foreign policy, [190], [192]-[194]; on Pres. Wilson's peace terms, [190], [193]; peace treaty with Russia, [194]; result of the war, [200]; resignation, [201], 17. Hintze, Adm. von, Foreign Secretary, [199]; resignation, [201]. Hoffmann, Gen., at the Brest-Litovsk Conference, [8]. **KÜHLMANN**, Herr von, at the Brest-Litovsk Conference, [7]; Foreign Minister, [190]; on the peace negotiations, [191]; with Ukraina, [192]; foreign policy, [197]; resignation, [198], 12. **LERCHENFELD**, Count von, on the ultimatum to Serbia, [210]. Lichnowsky, Prince, memoir, [196]. Lossberg, Gen. von, First Quartermaster-General, 19. Ludendorff, Gen. von, First Quartermaster-General, resignation, 19. **MAXIMILIAN**, Prince, Chancellor, [201], 17; on negotiations for peace, [202], [204]; resignation, [207], 19. Michaelis, Herr, Chancellor, [189]. Military operations in the East, [3], [10]-[12]; on the Western Front, [21]-[36]; retreat of the Army, [32], [34]. Mirbach, Count, assassinated, [230], 12. Monarchic federation, failure, [187]. **NAVAL** delegates, at Rosyth, 20. **PARIS** bombardment, 5. Peace negotiations, [44], [201]-[206], [298]-[301], 17, 18, 19. Political parties, [188], [210]. Prisoners, number of, captured, [23], [25], [27], [29]; treatment of British, [141]. Prussia, aggrandisement, [187]; Crown Prince of, renunciation of rights, [210]; Prince Henry of, flight, [207]. **RANTZAU**, Count, Foreign Secretary, [211]. Revolution, [206]. Russia, Treaty of Peace with, [5], [12], [13], [194], 4; map, [14]; result of the revolution, [188]. **SOLF**, Dr., Foreign Secretary, [201]; resignation, [211]. Soviets, Councils formed, [207]; Congress at Berlin, [211]. Spartacus Group, [208]. Strikes, [192]. Submarine campaign, [38], 3, 5, 13; failure, [40]; number sunk, 21. **TRAWLERS**, sunk, 7. **UKRAINIA**, Treaty of Peace with, [192], 3. **WAR**, casualties, [46]; credits, [196], [200]; loans, [196]; revelations on the origin, [210]. Warships, surrender, [46], 20. **ZIMMERMAN**, Herr, Foreign Minister, resignation, [189]
- GERMANY**.—William II., Emperor of, meeting with the Emperor of Austria, 8; abdication, [45], [207], [209], 19, 20; flight to Holland, [209]
- GIBALTAR**, Smith-Dorrien, Gen. Sir H., appointed Governor, 11
- GOODWIN**, Col. T. H. J. C., appointed Director-General of Army Medical services, 2
- GORDON**, C. D., Obit., 176
- GORDON**, G. B., "In the Alaskan Wilderness," 42
- GORELL**, Colonel Lord, in charge of a Department to co-ordinate education in the Army, [143]
- GOSSE**, E., "Three French Moralists," 47

- GRAFTON, Duke of, Obit., 209
 GRAY, Baroness, Obit., 218
 GREECE.—CONSTANTINE, ex-King, grant to, [244]. DODEKANESE islands, question of the, [244]. MILITARY operations, [244]. VENIZELOS, M., Prime Minister, [244]
 GREEN, W. E., Obit., 206
 GREENWELL, Rev. Dr. W., Obit., 162
 GREGORY, Sir P., Obit., 200
 GREGORY, R. P., Obit., 206
 GRIFFITHS, J., Obit., 209
 GUARDS Machine-Gun Regiment, formation, 8
Guildford Castle, attacked by a submarine, [18], 5
 GUILLAMORE, Viscount, Obit., 164
 GUNTER, Lieut.-Col. E., Obit., 187
 GUTHRIE, L. G., Obit., 212
 GWYNNE, H. A., editor of the *Morning Post*, fined, 4
 GWYNNE-VAUGHAN, Mrs., appointed Commandant of the Women's Royal Air Force, 15

 HADOW, Sir H., appointed Director of Education in the Army, [143]
 HAIG, Field-Marshal Sir D., Order to the troops, [27]; reception at Dover, [167]; in London, [168], 21; Despatch from, 101-149
 HAMID II., Abdul, Sultan of Turkey, Obit., 164
 HAMILTON, Gen. Sir I., appointed Lieutenant of the Tower of London, 15
 HARINGTON, Major-Gen. C. H., appointed Deputy Chief of the Imperial General Staff, 8
 HART, Gen. Sir R., Lieut.-Governor of Guernsey, resignation, 10
 HAYDON, F., Obit., 186
 HAYES, F. W., Obit., 190
 HEALY, Most Rev. Dr. J., Archbishop of Tuam, Obit., 171
 HEBB, Dr. R. G., Obit., 178
 HEDJAZ, The.—FEISUL, Emir, in London, [167], [265]. HUSSEIN Abu Ali, King, [265]
 HEINEMANN, W., publication of "Five Tales," 49; "Three French Moralists," 47
 HENDERSON, A., on the policy of the Labour Party, [157]
 — Lieut.-Gen. Sir D., Vice-President of the Air Council, resignation, 7
 HENRY, Sir E., Commissioner of Police, resignation, [133]
 HERON, Rev. J., Obit., 175
 HESSE, Prince Frederick Charles of, chosen King of Finland, 16; election, [238], 18
 HEWLETT, M., "Gudrid the Fair," 53
 HILLINGDON, Dow. Lady, Obit., 208
 HODDER & Stoughton, publication of "Conrad in Quest of his Youth," 50; "Fighting for Peace," 34; "The Kaiser I Knew," 30
 HODGE, A. H., Obit., 163
 HODGE, J., Minister of Labour, resignation, [162]
 HOERNLE, Dr. A. F. R., Obit., 204
 HOYT, W., Obit., 175
 HOLDICH, Col. Sir T. H., "Boundaries in Europe and the Near East," 32

 HOLLAND, Rev. H. S., Obit., 171
 HOLMES, T., Obit., 173
 HOLMES, Rev. T. S., Obit., 165
 HOME, Earl of, Obit., 176
 HOOVER, Mr., United States Food Controller, mission in Europe, 15
 HOUSMAN, L., "The Sheepfold," 56
 HOWELL, Brig.-Gen. A. A., Obit., 160
 HUDSON, W. H., Obit., 187
 HUGHES, W. M., Prime Minister of Australia, in London, [98], 11
 HUMBERT, Senator C., ex-proprietor of the *Paris Journal*, arrested, 4
 HUTCHINSON & Co., publication of "Secrets of the Bosphorus," 26
 HYDE, J. W., Obit., 176
 HYDE Park, demonstrations, [110]
 HYLTON, Lord, appointed Captain of the Yeoman of the Guard, 9

 ICELAND.—DENMARK, relations with, [259]
 IMPERIAL War Cabinet, [98]; meetings, [98], [124], [147], 11
 IMPORTS, value of, 79
 INDIA.—ARMY reform, [271]. BUDGET, [267]. CHELMSFORD, Lord, at the Legislative Council, [268], [271]. Constitutional Reform, report, [124], [267], [269], [272], 17, 82-101. DELHI War Conference, [268], 7. LEGISLATIVE Council, opened, [268], [271]. Lloyd, Capt. G. A., appointed Governor of Bombay, [272], 17. MACLAGEN, Sir E. D., Lieut.-Gov. of the Punjab, [272]. Montagu-Chelmsford report, [124], [267], [269], [272], 17, 82-101. NATIONAL Congress, Bombay, [271]. PATIALA, Maharajah of, in London, 11. SEDITION problem, report, [270]. Sinha, Sir S. P., in London, 11. TROOPS, maintenance of, [272]. WAR casualties, [272]. Willington, Lord, appointed Governor of Madras, [272], 17
 INDIAN Constitutional Reforms, Summary of the Report, 82-101
 INFLUENZA, epidemic, [138], [167], 18
 IPSWICH, Viscount, Obit., 175
 IRELAND.—CAMPBELL, Rt. Hon. Sir J., appointed Lord Chancellor, 10. Convention, report, [72], 6. DILLON, J., elected Chairman of the Nationalist Party, 5. FIRE-ARMS, carrying of, prohibited, 4. French, Viscount, appointed Lord-Lieutenant, [87], 8. GERMAN conspiracy discovery, [87]. HOME Rule Bill, [76]. MOLONEY, Rt. Hon. T. F., appointed Lord Chief Justice, 14. O'BRIEN, Rt. Hon. Sir I., Lord Chancellor, resignation, 10. O'CONNOR, Rt. Hon. J., appointed Judge of the High Court of Justice, 6; of the Court of Appeal, 14. PASSPORTS required for passengers, 8. SHORTT, E., appointed Chief Secretary, [87], 8. Sinn Feiners, arrested, [88], 9
 ISAACS, G., libel action, 21
 ITALY.—ARMISTICE, signed, [36], [184], 19. Austria-Hungary, military operations against, [30], [36], [184], [220]. BISSOLATI, Signor, resignation, [186]. CADORNA, Gen., Commander-in-Chief, placed on the retired list, 12. CURAZZO,

- captured, [38]. FINANCE, [183]. JUGO-SLAVS, relations with, [182], [184]. MOLA, Gen., concessions to the Jugo-Slavs, [186]. NATIONALIST Statesmen, Conference in Rome, [184]. ORLANDO, Signor, Prime Minister, in London, [187], [180]; on war aims, [180]; food supplies, [181]; the victory, [184]; foreign policy, [185]. PARLIAMENT, opened, [184]. RACES, Conference in Rome, [182]. SOCIALIST Party, Congress, [183]. Sonnino, Baron, in London, [167]; foreign policy, [181]. TITTONI, Signor, annexation policy, [185]. Trieste, troops enter, [184]. WALES, Prince of, in Rome, [182]; War, conflicting views on, [179]; Debt, proposed pooling, [184]; Loan, [183]. ITALY.—Victor Emmanuel, King of, at Paris, [178], 21. ITALY's Day, celebrated in London, 16.
- JACOB, Col. G. A., Obit., 174.
- JAMES, Dr. M. R., appointed Provost of Eton, 13.
- JAMES, R. J., publication of "Industrial Justice through Banking Reform," 48.
- JAPAN.—CABINET, resign, [277], 16. China, relations with, [275], [276]. Food riots, [277]. GOTO, Baron, Foreign Minister, [277]. HARA, K., Prime Minister, [277]. MOTONO, Viscount, resignation, [277]. SIBERIA, intervention in, [277]. VLADIVOSTOK, marines land at, [284], [276].
- JERRED, Sir W. T., Obit., 195.
- JERROLD, L., Obit., 200.
- JONAS, Sir J., degraded from the degree of Knight Bachelor, 15.
- JUGO-SLAV STATE.—INDEPENDENCE, [219]. KOROSEK, M., Vice-Premier, [222], [246]. NATIONAL Council, [219]. PASHITCH, M., Premier, [222], [246]. SERBIA, union with, [222], [245].
- KENSINGTON, Sir A., Obit., 200.
- KIDD, J., Obit., 188.
- KIGGELL, Lieut.-Gen. Sir L. E., appointed Lieut.-Governor of Guernsey, 10.
- KITCHENER, M. E., Obit., 159.
- KITCHENS, national, establishment of, [93], [103]; number, [140].
- KITCHIN, J., estimate on the cost of the war, 78.
- KNIGHTHOODS conferred, 10.
- KNOWLES, Vice-Adm. Sir C. G. F., Obit., 168.
- KNOWLES, Lady, Obit., 176.
- KNOX-LITTLE, Rev. Canon W. J., Obit., 163.
- LABOUR Party, Conferences at the Albert Hall, [157]; London, [99]-[101], 11, 20; Nottingham, [48], [70]; Westminster, [70], [138]; policy, [157], [162].
- and Socialist, Inter-allied, Conference in London, 4; close of the, 4.
- LAMBERT, C., Obit., 197.
- LANE, J., publication of "Mr. Cushing and Mlle. du Chastel," 52; "The Laws of Chance," 55; "Robert Shenstone," 58.
- LANGLEY, Sir W., Obit., 194.
- LAMINGTON, J. D., Obit., 202.
- LAW, Rt. Hon. B., on trade policy, [125]; on the sale of War Bonds, [148]; election manifesto, [158]-[162].
- LAWRENCE, C. E., "Mrs. Bente," 54.
- LEE, Sir H. A., Obit., 201.
- LEE, Lord, Director-General of Food Production, resignation, 18.
- LEHMANN, L., Obit., 192.
- LEWIS, Dr. S. L., Obit., 170.
- LIECHTENSTEIN, [264].
- LISTER, Engineer Rear-Adm. F. H., Obit., 188.
- LISTON-FOULIS, Sir W., Obit., 174.
- LITERATURE.—Retrospect of, 23-50; Fiction, 49-59; General Literature, 35-49; War Books, 23-35.
- LITHUANIA.—INDEPENDENCE proclaimed, [238]. ULLMAN, K., elected President, [239]. Urach, Duke William of, elected King, [239].
- LLOYD, Capt. G. A., appointed Governor of Bombay, 17.
- Hon. W. F., Prime Minister of Newfoundland, appointed member of the Privy Council, 9; in London, [98].
- LOYDS and the Capital and Counties Banks, amalgamation, [127], 80.
- LOCKHART, R., Acting British Consul-General in Moscow, arrested by Bolsheviks, 14; released, 14.
- LONDON County Westminster and Parr's Banks, amalgamation, [55], 3, 80.
- Joint Stock and the London City and Midland Banks, amalgamation, [55], [127], 12, 80.
- Provincial and South-Western and Barclay's Banks, amalgamation, [55], [127], 12, 80.
- LONGMANS, Green & Co., publication of "The Epistles of Erasmus," 40; "Life of Frederick Courtenay Selous," 37; "The Megalithic Culture of Indonesia," 42; "Submarine and Anti-Submarine," 23.
- LONGSTAFF, Lieut.-Col. L. W., Obit., 206.
- LONGWORTH-DAMES, C. A. B., Obit., 192.
- LORD Mayor, address to the King and Queen, [106]; banquet, [149], 19; Show, [149].
- LUMSDEN, Gen. Sir P. S., Obit., 202.
- LUXEMBURG.—ANTOINETTE, Princess, betrothal, [249]; ELECTION, General, [248]; result, [249].
- LYELL, Major the Hon. C. H., Obit., 196.
- LYONS, T. H., Obit., 207.
- LYTTON, Earl of, appointed British Commissioner for propaganda in France, 17.
- MACCARTHY, D., "Remnants," 49.
- MACDONOGH, Major-Gen. Sir G. M. W., appointed Adjutant-General to the Forces, 15.
- MACKARNES, Dr. C. C., Obit., 167.
- MACKENZIE, Lieut. Sir R. M., Obit., 174.
- MACKINTOSH, Capt. A. A., Obit., 196.
- MACMILLAN & Co., publication of "Boundaries in Europe and the Near East," 32.
- MACNAMARA, N. C., Obit., 206.
- MACPHERSON, I., appointed Vice-President of the Army Council, 8.
- MACRADDY, Lieut.-Gen. Sir C. F., appointed Commissioner of Police, [184].

- MADAGASCAR.**—**CATTLE** industry, [263].
TIMBER, export of, [282]. **Trade**, [282]
MAGNUS, L., "A General Sketch of European Literature," 35
Manchester Guardian, results of the General Election, [164]
MANDERSON, Major-Gen. G. R., Obit., 159
MANN, J. R., Obit., 192
MARGARINE, shortage of, 2; rationing, 4
MARKHAM, Adm. Sir A. H., Obit., 199
MARKS, M., Obit., 177
MARSH, Mr., "Memoir of Rupert Brooke," 45
MARY, Queen, anniversary of her wedding, [105]; at the Guildhall, [106]; Albert Hall, 9; St. Margaret's, Westminster, [129]
MASSEY, W. F., Prime Minister of New Zealand, in London, [98], 10
MAUDE, A., "Leo Tolstoy," 39
MAUDSLEY, Dr. H., Obit., 162
MAUNSEL & Co., publication of "The Economic History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century," 43
MAURICE, Major-Gen. Sir F., charges against Ministers, [81]; military correspondent of the *Daily News*, [86] 18
MAY, W. C., Obit., 195
MAYO, Dow. Countess of, Obit., 163
MCCUDDEN, 2nd Lieut. J. B., awarded the V.C., 6
McGURK, J., at the Albert Hall, [157]
McNAUGHT, Dr., Obit., 75
MEAT card, [49]; price, increase in the, 8, 15, 16; rationing, [48]-[50], [57], [102], 4; shortage, [48], 1, 2
MEATH, Countess of, Obit., 201
MEATLESS days, compulsory, 2; abolition, 9
MECKLENBURG-STRELITZ, A. F., Grand Duke of, Obit., 167
MELROSE, publication of "A Poet's Pilgrimage," 46
MERRICK, L., "Conrad in Quest of his Youth," 50
MERRY, Rev. Dr. W. W., Obit., 168
MESTON, Sir J., appointed Financial Member of the Governor's Council in India, 3
METHUEN & Co., publication of "Leo Tolstoy," 39
MEULEN, H., "Industrial Justice through Banking Reform," 48
MEXICO.—**CARRANZA**, Senor, President, [307]; policy, [308]. **EXPORTS**, restriction of, [308]
MIDDLETON, E. C., "Air-fare of To-day and of the Future," 33
MILES, C. A., Obit., 163
MILFORD, publication of "The League of Nations: An Historical Argument," 44
MILITARY honours, conferred, Cavan, Lord, 1; Haldane, General, 1; Lambton, General W., 1; Milne, General, 1; Plumer, General, 1; Trenchard, General, 1
 — Service Act, proclamation, 7
MILLAIS, J. G., "Life of Frederick Courtenay Selous," 37
MILNER, Viscount, appointed Secretary of State for War, [76], 7; at the Supreme War Council meetings, 8
MINERS' Federation Conference, [139]
MITCHELL, C., Obit., 173
MITCHELL-THOMPSON, Sir M., Obit., 205
MITCHINSON, Rt. Rev. J., Obit., 198
MOHAMMED V., Sultan of Turkey, Obit., [240], 12, 183
MOLONY, Rt. Hon. T. F., appointed Lord Chief Justice in Ireland, 14
MONCRIEFF, Lieut.-Gen. G. H., Obit., 196
MONTAGU-CHELMSFORD Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms, [124]
MONTENEGRO.—**PODGORITZA**, congress at, [246]. **SERBIA**, relations with, [245], [246]
 — Prince M. of, Obit., 168
 — Nicholas, King, deposed, [246], 20
MOORE, Vice-Adm. W. U., Obit., 172
MORGENTHAU, H., "Secrets of the Bosphorus," 26
MORRIS, Rev. Canon, Obit., 159
MORRIS, Sir E., Prime Minister of Newfoundland, resignation, 1; Barony conferred, 1
MOULE, Rev. A. E., Obit., 188
MOYSEY, H. L., Obit., 188
 "MUEHLON'S Diary, Dr.," 31
MUNRO-FERGUSON, Mrs., Obit., 179
MURRAY, J., publication of "General Smuts' Campaign in East Africa," 27; "German Colonies: A Plea for the Native Races," 26
MUSCOVITE REPUBLIC, [226]. *See* Russia
MUSIC.—**Retrospect of**: **BEECHAM** concert, 73. **OPERAS**, 74. **ORCHESTRAL** concerts, 75. **PROMENADE** concerts, 75. **QUEEN'S** Hall concerts, 74, 75. **ROYAL** Carl Rosa Company, 74. **ROYAL** Choral Society, 74. **ROYAL** Philharmonic Society, 74. **SUNDAY** concerts, 75. **SYMPHONY** concerts, 74
NAIRNE, Sir G., appointed Comptroller of the Bank of England, 8, 79
NATIONAL Executive, manifesto, [162]
 — Liberal Federation, Manchester, [144]
 — Provincial Bank of England and the Union of London and Smith's Banks, amalgamation, [55]
 — War Bonds, sale of, [148], 77
NAVY, Officers, increase of pay, 2
NETHERLANDS, THE. — **CABINET**, resign, [252]; the new, [252]. **EAST** Indies, Budget, [278]; Limburg-Stirum, Gov.-Gen. Count van, opens the Diet, [278]; Volksraad or People's Diet established, [278]. **ELECTION**, General, [252]. **FOOD** rationing, [251]. **LOUDON**, Jonkheer, on the negotiations with the Associated Powers, [250]. **PARLIAMENT**, opened, [253]. Prisoners of war, conference on the exchange, [252]. **SHIPS**, requisitioning, [249]-[251]. **ZUIDER Zee**, draining of the, [251], [253]
NEVILL, M. D. A., Obit., 199
NEVILLE, Mr., Justice, Obit., 196
NEW Year Honours, List of, 1
NEW ZEALAND. — **ELECTIONS**, [319]. **LIVERPOOL**, Lord, Gov.-Gen., at the opening of Parliament, [320]. **Loan**, issue of, [319]. **MASSARY**, W. F., in London, [319], 10. **PARLIAMENT**, opened, [320]. **REFORM** Party and the

Liberals, coalition, [319]. WAR casualties, [321]. Ward, Sir J., on Imperial relations, [320]

NEWBOLT, Sir H., "Submarine and Anti-submarine," 23

NEWFOUNDLAND.—CONSCRIPTION Bill, [307]. LEGISLATURE, opens, [307]

MORRIS, Sir E., Prime Minister, resignation, 1

NEWMARCH, F. W., Obit., 159

NICHOLS, F. M., "The Epistles of Erasmus," 40

NICHOLSON, Sir C., Obit., 207

NICHOLSON, Field-Marshal Lord, Obit., 191

NICHOLSON, S. H., appointed organist at Westminster Abbey, 75

NISBET & Co., publication of "The Return of the Soldier," 56

NOEL, Adm. Sir G., Obit., 179

NOMINATIVE Bonds, sale of, 1

NORMAN, Rev. Canon A. M., Obit., 198

NORMAN, Commander F. M., Obit., 195

NORMAN, Rt. Hon. Sir H., appointed member of the Air Council, 3

NORTHCLIFFE, Lord, appointed Director of Propaganda, 4; entertains members of the Overseas press, 14

NORTHEY, Major-Gen. E., appointed, Governor of the East Africa Protectorate, [284], 11; knighthood conferred, [284]

NORTHUMBERLAND, Duke of, Obit., 178

NORTON, Prof. R., Obit., 187

OATS, price of, 15

OBITUARY, 159-214. *See* under separate names

O'BRIEN, G., "The Economic History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century," 43

O'BRIEN, Rt. Hon. Sir I., Lord Chancellor of Ireland, resignation, 10; peerage conferred, 10

O'BRIEN, R. B., Obit., 171

O'CONNOR, Rt. Hon. J., appointed Judge of the High Court of Justice in Ireland, 6; of the Court of Appeal, 14

OHNET, G., Obit., 177

OIL, mineral, production, [56]

OLDFIELD, Sir R. C., Obit., 218

O'NEILL, Dr. C., Obit., 160

ORLEANS and Braganza, Capt. Prince A. of, Obit., 207

OUR Day, celebration of, 19

PAGE, Dr. W. H., American Ambassador in London, retirement, 15; Obit., 212

PAGET, Sir R. S., appointed Ambassador in Brazil, 16

PAGET, Brig.-Gen., W. L. H., Obit., 181

PAINE, Major-Gen., Sir G., appointed Inspector-General of the Royal Air Force, 15

PALLADINO, E., Obit., 179

PARKER, Lord, Obit., 184

PARLIAMENT.—Reassembled, [50], [71], [88]; King's Speech, [54], [55], [58], [155]; prorogued, [54], [155], 20; opened, [58], 3; Whitsuntide recess, [87]; adjourned, [105], [128]; dissolution, [155], 20

ADDRESS, debate on, in the House of Commons, [58]

ADDRESSES presented to King George V., [154]

BUDGET, [76]-[78], 77

CREDIT, Votes of, [53], [64], [93], [115], [153], 76

MINISTERS, appointment of, [76], [121]

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES.—ADDRESS, Law, B., [59]; Samuel, H., [59]

ALIENS Bill, Carson, Sir E., [113]; Cave, Sir G., [112]; Finlay, Lord, [114]; Samuel, H., [113]

ARMISTICE terms, George, D. L., [151]

ARMY Estimates, Macpherson, J. I., [62]

BUDGET, Arnold, S., [80]; Baldwin, S., [79]; Illingworth, A., [80]; Law, B., [78], [80]; McKenna, R., [79]; Samuel, H., [79]; Taylor, T., [80]

COMMERCIAL policy, Law, B., [86]

COAL consumption, Stanley, Sir A., [128]

CREDIT, Votes of, Law, B., [64], [94], [115], [153]; McKenna, R., [65], [94], [116]

Daily Chronicle, sale of, Dalziel, Sir H., [141]; Pringle, W. M. R., [141]

EDUCATION Bill, Fisher, H. A. L., [66], [67], [115]; Hibbert, Sir H., [87]; Lewis, H., [68], [89]; Magnus, Sir P., [68]; Marriott, J. A. R., [68]; O'Grady, J., [68]; Peto, B. E., [66], [89]; Sykes, Sir M., [67]

ENEMY Alien Peril, Beresford, Lord, [111]; Buckmaster, Lord, [111]; Cave, Sir G., [111], [114]; Dalziel, Sir H., [110]; George, D. L., [112]

EXPENDITURE, National, Law, B., [53], [95]; Samuel, H., [53], [95]

FINANCE Bill, Henry, Sir C., [90]; Law, B., [90], [96]; Mason, J., [90]; Samuel, H., [90]

FINANCIAL situation, Curzon, Lord, [117]; Emmott, Lord, [117]; Faringdon, Lord, [117]; Incheape, Lord, [116]

FOOD policy, Clynes, J. R., [60], [64]; Lough, T., [59]; Meysey-Thompson, Col., [59]; Milner, Lord, [63]; Prothero, R., [59]; Tryon, Major, [59]; Wood, Major, [59]

FOOD supplies, Clynes, J. R., [92]

GEORGE, V., King, addresses to, Asquith, H. H., [154]; Curzon, Lord, [109], [154]; George, D. L., [109]; Law, B., [154]

HOME Rule Bill, Curzon, Lord, [91]; Devlin, J., [76]; George, D. L., [75], [91]

HOUSING question, Fisher, H., [101]

INDIAN Constitutional Reforms, Crewe, Lord, [145]; Curzon, Lord, [146]; Donoughmore, Lord, [146]; Islington, Lord, [145]; Lansdowne, Lord, [145]; Middleton, Lord, [145]; Selborne, Lord, [146]

IRELAND, position in, Asquith, H. H., [124]; Dillon, J., [123]; Law, B., [124]; Reid, Sir G., [123]; Shortt, E., [123]; Sykes, Sir M., [123]

—unrest in, Curzon, Lord, [69]; Salisbury, Lord, [69]

IRISH question, Asquith, H. H., [146]; Law, B., [146]; O'Connor, T. P., [146]; Shortt, E., [146]

—recruits, grants of land, Samuels, A., [91]

PARLIAMENT, *cont.*

- MAN-POWER Bill, Asquith, H. H., [74]; Cave, Sir G., [73]; Dillon, J., [78]; Geddes, Sir A., [75]; George, D. L., [71]; Hobhouse, Sir C., [73]; Law, B., [59], [74]; Maclean, Sir D., [73]; Samuel, H., [59]
- MAURICE, Major-Gen. Sir F., allegations, Asquith, H. H., [83], [84]; Carson, Sir E., [84]; George, D. L., [85]; Law, B., [83]; Meux, Sir H., [84]; Pringle, W. M. R., [84]
- MILITARY Service Bill, Geddes, Sir A., [50]; George, D. L., [71], 6
- situation, George, D. L., [128]
- NAVY Estimates, Geddes, Sir E., [68]
- PARLIAMENT, extension of, Asquith, H. H., [120]; Law, B., [120]; Ponsonby, A., [120]
- PENSIONS, question of, Hodge, J., [88]
- POLICE strike, Cave, Sir G., [133]; Wiles, T., [133]
- POST Office work, Illingworth, A., [93]
- PRESS, relations with the Government, Asquith, H. H., [65]; Chamberlain, A., [61], [65]; George, D. L., [66]; Hughes, S. L., [65]
- PRISONERS of War, exchange, Curzon, Lord, [89]; Devonport, Lord, [89]; Law, B., [89]; Newton, Lord, [89], [119]
- of war, treatment, Cave, Sir G., [141], [142]; Craig, Capt. C., [142]
- REGISTER, the new, Fisher, H., [120]; Gilbert, J. D., [120]
- SHIPBUILDING, Craig, Lieut.-Com. N., [119]; France, G. A., [117]; Geddes, Sir E., [69], [118]; Greenwood, Sir H., [117]; Griffiths, Sir J. N., [118]; Lambert, G., [119]; Richardson, A., [119]; Runciman, W., [119]
- SHIPPING, Holt, R. D., [154]; Money, Sir L. C., [154]; Runciman, W., [153]
- SOLDIERS, separation allowances, Barnes, G. N., [143]; Hogge, J. M., [143]; Tootill, R., [143]
- SUGAR Commission Report, Bathurst, Sir C., [93]
- TRADE Boards Bill, Bentinck, Lord H., [97]; Bridgeman, W. C., [97]; Mason, J., [97]; Roberts, G., [97]; Whitley, J. H., [97]
- report on, Stanley, Sir A., [86]
- TRENCHARD, General, resignation, Asquith, H. H., [82]; Carson, Sir E., [83]; Cecil, Lord H., [81]; George, D. L., [81]; Verney, Sir H., [81]
- UNEMPLOYMENT, provision, Addison, Dr., [152]
- VERSAILLES Council, Asquith, H. H., [58], [61]; Chamberlain, A., [61]; George, D. L., [58], [60]
- WAR Cabinet system, Curzon, Lord, [95]; Middleton, Lord, [95]
- WOMEN members of Parliament, Asquith, H. H., [145]; Cecil, Lord R., [144]; Meux, Sir H., [145]; Peto, B. E., [145]; Samuel, H., [144]; Ward, A., [145]
- PARR's and the London County Westminster Banks, amalgamation, [55], 3, 80
- PARRY, Sir C. H. H., Obit., 195
- PARRY, Sir E., Obit., 75

- PAUL, K., Trench, Trubner & Co., publication of "A General Sketch of European Literature," 35
- PAULET, Lady C., Obit., 211
- PEACE rejoicings, [150]-[152]
- PEARLS, collection of, sale, [58], [167]
- PEASE, Rt. Hon. A. F., appointed Second Civil Lord of the Admiralty, 2
- PEDLER, Sir A., Obit., 178
- PEERAGES conferred, Arthur, Sir M., 10; Bathurst, Sir C., 17; Bertie, Rt. Hon. Lord, 14; Cawley, Sir F., 1; Faber, G. D., 10; Forrest, Rt. Hon. Sir J., 3; Lee, Col. Sir A. H., 11; Lonsdale, Sir J., 1; Morris, Sir E., 1; O'Brien, Sir I., 10; Paget, A., 1; Rhondda, Lord, 10; St. Davids, Lord, 10; Tatem, Sir W., 10; Weir, Sir W., 11; Wimborne, Baron, 9; Woodhouse, Sir J., 1
- PERCIVAL, Rt. Rev. J., Obit., 209
- PERRY, W. J., "The Megalithic Culture of Indonesia," 42
- PERSHING, General J., Commander-in-Chief of the United States Army, 13, 14; G.C.B., conferred, 13; attack on St. Mihiel, [34]
- PERSIA.—ANGLO-RUSSIAN Treaty of 1907, annulled, [265]. BAKU, evacuated, [266]. TABRIZ, occupied, [266]
- PERUGINI, C. E., Obit., 211
- PETHEBRIDGE, Sir S. A., Obit., 162
- PHEAR, Rev. S. G., Obit., 206
- PHILLIPS-WOLLEY, Sir C. O. L., Obit., 183
- PHILLIPSON, C., "Alsace-Lorraine: Past, Present, and Future, 24-26
- PICKFORD, Lord Justice, appointed President of the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty division, 18
- PIRRIE, Lord, appointed Controller of Merchant Shipping, [69], 5
- PLAYFAIR, A., Obit., 189
- PLIMMER, Prof. H. G., Obit., 182
- POLAND. — CRAWOW, People's Republic proclaimed, [236]. Jews, pogrom against, [236]. KHOLM district, [236]. Kucharszewski, J., Prime Minister, [236]; resignation, [236]. LEMBERG, occupied, [236]. REGENCY Council, established, [236]. Steczkowski, M., Prime Minister, [236]
- POLLARD, A. F., "The League of Nations: An Historical Argument," 44
- POLLEN, Sir R. H., Obit., 177
- POLTMORE, Baron, Obit., 200
- PORTUGAL.—CABINET, the new, [258]; Castro, Dr. A. de, arrested, [258]. ELECTION, Général, [258]. PAES, Senhor S., provisional President, [257]; assassinated, [258], 21. Parliament opened, [258]
- POSTAGE rates, increase of, 10, 77
- POTATOES, supply of, [57], [102]
- POULETT, Earl, Obit., 184
- POYNTER, Sir E., President of the Royal Academy, resignation, 70
- PRICE, M. P., "War and Revolution in Asiatic Russia," 39
- PRIOR, J., Obit., 196
- PRISONERS of War, British, treatment in Germany, [141]; return, [165]
- PRIVY Councillorships conferred, Adamson, W., 10; Cecil, Lord H., 1

CRAIK, Sir H., 1; Hewart, Sir G., 1;
Norman, Sir H., 1; Macpherson, J. I.,
10

PUBLIC Documents, 82-158

PUTNAM, R., "Luxemburg and her Neigh-
bours," 48

PUTNAM & Sons, publication of "Luxem-
burg and her Neighbours," 43

QUEEN'S Hall, meeting at, [163]

QUILLER-COUCH, Sir A., "Foe-Farrell,"
51

RACING, decision on, 9

RAILWAY travelling restrictions, [86], [104]
—— Katanga, completion of, 9

RAILWAYMEN, eight-hour day conceded,
[166], 21

RAMSAY, Com., the Hon. A., betrothal, 22

RAMSEY, F., "Mr. Cushing and Mlle. du
Chastel," 52

RATION books, [127]

RATIONING, compulsory, necessity for, [48],
2

RAVENSWORTH, Lady, Obit., 190

RAWLINSON, Gen. Sir H., in command of
the Fifth Army, 6

RAWSON, Col. R., Obit., 197

READING, Earl of, appointed High Com-
missioner and Special Ambassador in
the United States, 1

REDMOND, J., Obit., 168

REFORM Act, the new, [51]-[53]

REID, Sir G. H., Obit., 190

RENAULT, L., Obit., 164

RENDEL, Sir A. M., Obit., 162

RENSHAW, Sir C. B., Obit., 169

REPIN, I. E., Obit., 186

REPINGTON, Lieut.-Col. C., military cor-
respondent of the *Morning Post*, fined,
4

RESTAURANTS, State, established, [128]

RESTLER, Sir J. W., Obit., 201

REWA, Maharaja of, Obit., 201

RHONDDA, Lord, on compulsory rationing,
2; Obit., [121], 12, 182; value of his
estate, 21

RICE, Sir C. S., Obit., 166

RICHARD, Mrs. V., "The Fire of Green
Boughs," 55

RICHARDS, J. M., Obit., 187

RIDDELL, Sir A. O., Obit., 195

RIVET, C., "The Last of the Romanoffs,"
33

ROBERTS, F. T., Obit., 186

ROBERTSON, Sir F. A., Obit., 211

ROBERTSON, Gen. Sir W., Chief of the
Imperial General Staff, resignation,
[60], 3; in command of the forces in
Great Britain, 10

ROBINSON, W. A., appointed permanent
Secretary to the Air Council, 4

ROBINSON, Capt. W. L., Obit., 214

ROBSON, Lord, Obit., 190

ROMER, Sir R., Obit., 172

ROSE, G. P., Obit., 205

ROSS, R. B., Obit., 71, 194

ROSSE, Earl of, Obit., 181

ROSTAND, E., Obit., 208

ROSTH, British and German Naval
delegates, meeting, 20

ROTHERMERE, Lord, President of the Air
Council, 1; resignation, 7

ROYAL Air Force, decorations and medals,
10

RUMANIA.—AVARESCU, General, Prime
Minister, [242]; resignation, [242].

BESSARABIA, union with, [225], [242].
Bolshevik revolution, [241]. Buchar-
est, Treaty of, [242]. COANDA, General,

Prime Minister, [242]. DOBRUDJA,
session of, [242]. ELECTION, General

[242]. MARGHILOMAN, M., Prime
Minister, [242]; resignation, [242]

RUSSELL, Sir J. A., Obit., 161

RUSSIA.—ARCHANGEL, British and
French troops land at, [230], 14.

Armistice, [2], [5]. Army, result of
the defeat, [1], [3], [15]-[17]; demob-
ilisation, 3. BAKU occupied, 20.

Bolshevik Republic, [226]; Red
Guards, [11]; atrocities, [228]-[230].

15; United States sever relations
with, 14. Brest-Litovsk, peace nego-
tiations, [4]-[9], [194], [229].

CONSTITUENT Assembly opened, [227];
dissolved, [228]. Cromie, Capt. F.,
murdered, [230], 15. EASTERN Europe,

[224]. Eliot, Sir C., appointed British
High Commissioner to Siberia, 14.

Empire, dissolution, [223]-[226]. GER-
MANY, Treaty of Peace with, [5], [12],
[194]. 4. KERENSKY, in London, [101],

11. LENIN, M., Prime Minister, [227].
Lockhart, R., arrested, by Bolsheviks,

14; released, 14. MILITARY opera-
tions, [10]. Mirbach, Count, assass-
inated, [230], 12. Muscovy, State of,

[15], [226]. PEACE terms with Ger-
many, [5], [12], [194], 4; signed, [13].
Provinces, independence of, [14], [225].

REVOLUTION, result, [223]. SOVIETS,
Congress at Moscow, [229]. Declara-
tion, [227]. TREPOFF, M., murdered,

[229]. Trotsky, M., at the Brest-
Litovsk Conference, [7]; Foreign
Minister, [227]; resignation, [229].

VLADIVOSTOCK, Japanese contingents
at, 14

—— Nicholas II., ex-Tsar, murdered,
[229], 13, Obit., 185

SACKVILLE-WEST, Major-Gen. the Hon. C.
J., appointed Acting British Military
representative at Versailles, 6

SAGE, Mrs. R., Obit., 201

SALVAGE Council, National, functions of
the, 5

SANDERS, Lieut.-Col. R. A., appointed
Treasurer of the Household, 11

SARRAIL, General, retirement, 6

SAUNDEY, Prof. R., Obit., 189

SAVORY, Vice-Adm. H. W., Obit., 167

SCHIFF, Sir E. F., Obit., 201

SCIENCE.—Retrospect of: Biological, 64-
68; Physical, 60-64

SCOTT, W., Obit., 176

SCOTT-GATTY, Sir A. S., Obit., 211

SWELEY, Major-Gen., the Rt. Hon. J. E. B.,
appointed Under-Secretary to the
Minister of Munitions, [121], 13.

SELLAR, E. M., Obit., 164.

SELOUS, Capt. F. H. B., Obit., 159

SELWYN, Rev. E. C., Obit., 202

SERBIA.—ITALY, controversy with, [245].
JUGO-SLAVS, union with [222], [245].

- MONTENEGRO**, relations with, [245].
PASHTON, M., Prime Minister, [245].
PROTITCH, S., Prime Minister, [246].
SHAW, Sir D. M., Obit., 193.
SHAW, Sir N., appointed Scientific Adviser in meteorology, 9.
SHIPBUILDING, record of, [40], 81.
SHIPPING DISASTERS.—*Andania*, 2; Armed boarding steamer, 10, 16; *Audacious*, 20; Auxiliary, 19; *Barunga*, [42], 12; Belgian relief ship, 15; *Boxer*, 3; *Breslau*, [18], 2; British monitors, [18], 16; *Britannia*, 19; *Calgarian*, [19], 4; *Carolina*, [42]; *Cassandra*, [43], 21; *Coneslip*, 7; Destroyers, 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 14; *Djemnah*, 12; *Floralzel*, 4; *Galway Castle*, 16; German destroyers, 5; torpedo-boats, 5; *Glenart Castle*, [18], 4; *Goeben*, 2; *Hazard*, 3; *Hiramo Maru*, 18; *Iusticia*, [43], 13; *Kashmir*, [43], 18; *Kawachi*, [42], 12; *Leasowe Castle*, [42], 9; *Leinster*, [43], 18; *Llandoverly Castle*, 11; *Louvain*, 2; *Marmora*, [43], 13; *Mechanician*, 2; mine-sweepers, 5, 8; *Moldavia*, [42], 9; motor-boats, [43]; *Patia*, 11; *Otranto*, [43], 18; patrol boats, [18], 19; *President Howard*, [284]; *President Lincoln*, 10; *Racoon*, 2; *Reva*, [18], 1; *Szent Istvan*, 11; *Ticonderoga*, 17; torpedo-boats, 7, 13, 14, 17; *Tuscania*, [18], 3; *Warilda*, [43], 14; *Westover*, 12.
 — losses, [19], [39]; statistics on, [39].
SHORTER, Mrs. C., Obit., 159.
SHORTT, E., appointed Chief Secretary of Ireland, [87], 8.
SIAM, [273].
SIBERIA, [225], [233]. **BOLSHEVIK** guns captured, [235]. **CZECHO-SLOVAKS** at Vladivostock, [234]. **HORVATH**, General, President, [235]. **IRKUTSK** captured, [235]. **JAPANESE** marines at Vladivostock, [234], [276]. **KOLTCHAK**, Admiral, Dictator, [235]. **PROVISIONAL** Government established [235]. **TOMSK** Council, [234]. **UFA**, Council at, [235].
SIDGWICK, Mrs. A., "Karen," 55.
SIDGWICK & Jackson, publication of "Collected Poems of Rupert Brooke," 45.
SIGERSON, D., Obit., 159.
SINGH, Prince V. D., Obit., 181.
SKEFFINGTON & Son, publication of "With the Austrian Army in Galicia," 28-30.
SMITH, Rev. J. A., Obit., 208.
SMITH, L. P., "Trivia," 49.
SMITH, Sir L., Obit., 181.
SMITH-DORRIEN, General Sir H., appointed Governor of Gibraltar, 11.
SMYTHE, L. P., Obit., 185.
SOCIETY for Promoting Christian Knowledge, publication of "Thirty Years in Tropical Australia," 41.
SOUTHBOROUGH, Lord, Chairman of the Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform, [272], 17.
SPAIN.—**ALHUCEMAS**, Marq., Prime Minister, [255], [257]; resignation, [256]. Army reforms, [256]. **BUDGET**, the, [257]. **CABINET**, the new, [256]; resign, [257]. Coalition Government, formed, [255]. **ELECTION**, General, [255]. **MAURA**, Senor, Prime Minister, [256]. **PARLIAMENT**, dissolved, [255]; opened, [256]. **ROMANONES**, Count, Prime Minister, [257]. **SHIPS** sunk by German submarines, [256].
SPLSBURY, Rev. J. H. G., Obit., 172.
SPITZBERGEN.—Ebeltoft harbour, British flag hoisted, [264], 17.
SPRING Rice, Sir C., Ambassador at Washington, retirement, 1.
STAR, discovery of a new, 10.
STEPHENSON, Sir W. H., Obit., 177.
STONEHENGE, presented to the nation, 16.
STOFFORD, Rear-Adm. the Hon. W. G., Obit., 208.
STRATHEDEN and Campbell, Baron, Obit., 212.
STRATON, Rt. Rev. N. D. J., Obit., 173.
STRICKLAND, Lady E., Obit., 211.
STRIKES, Cotton-spinners, Lancashire, [134], [166], 16, 21. Firemen, London, averted, [134]. Miners, Rotherham, [131]. Munition workers, Birmingham, [122]; Coventry, [121], 13; Leeds, [122]. Omnibus Conductresses, London, [130]. Police, London, [131], 15; terms of the settlement, [132], 16. Railwaymen, [135], 16; ended, 17. Shipwrights on the Clyde, [136].
STRONG, Prof. H. A., Obit., 159.
SUBMARINE-chasers, attacks on German submarines, [40].
SUFFIELD, Colonel Lord, Captain of the Yeoman Guard, resignation, 9.
SUGAR Commission, report, [93].
SULLIVAN, J. L., Obit., 163.
SUMMER-time, commencement, [56], 6.
SUTHERLAND, J. E., Obit., 188.
SWEDEN.—**AALAND** Islands, question, [261]; deputation from, [262]. **CENSUS**, [263]. Christiania, meeting of the three Scandinavian Sovereigns, [261]. Coalition Government formed, [261]. Commercial franchise, democratisation Bill, [262]. Eden, Mr., Prime Minister, [261]. **ELECTION**, General, [261], [263]. **FINLAND**, relations with, [262]. **GREAT BRITAIN**, loan of ships, [262], 10. **PARLIAMENT** opened, [261]. **SHIPPING** losses, [263], [264].
 — Prince Eric of, Obit., 192.
 — Gustav, King, opens Parliament, [261].
SWINEY, Major-Gen. J., Obit., 179.
SWITZERLAND.—**ADOR**, G., President, [254]. Food rationing, [253]. **MOTTA**, G., Vice-President, [254]. **PROPORTIONAL** Representation, referendum on, [254]. **SOCIALISTS'** strike, [254].
SYKES, Major-Gen. F. H., appointed Chief of the Air Staff, 7.
TALBOT, E. C., Obit., 192.
TASLAVANU, O. C., "With the Austrian Army in Galicia," 28-30.
TATA, Sir R., Obit., 169.
TEDDER, Sir A. J., Commissioner of Customs and Excise, resignation, 6.
TENNANT, G., Obit., 176.
THOMAS, J. H., General Secretary of the National Union of Railwaymen,

- resignation, [136], 17; on the policy of the Labour Party, [157]
- THOMSON, Sir J. J., appointed Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, 3
- THWAITES, Major-Gen. W., appointed Director of Military Intelligence, 16
- Times* The, announcements in, 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21; publication of a letter from Major-Gen. Sir F. Maurice, [81], [83]; increase in the price, 5; publishes an account of the Report of the Irish Convention, 6; letter from the King, 7; British Red Cross Society, amount of the Fund, 7, 12, 22; report of the sale of the *Daily Chronicle*, 18; on the number of German submarines sunk, 21; results of the General Election, [164]; on the visit of President Wilson to London, [168]
- TODD, M., Obit., 189
- TOTTENHAM, Col. C. G. Obit., 177
- TRADE, Board of, regulations, 5; reorganised, [55]; report on, [86]
- TRADES Union Congress, at Derby, [137], 15
- TRAFALGAR Square, battle scene, [148]
- TRENCHARD, Major-Gen. Sir H., Chief of the Air Staff, 1; resignation, [81], 7
- TRITTON, Sir C. E., Obit., 214
- TURKESTAN REPUBLIC, [225], [239]
- TURKEY.—ARMISTICE terms, 149; signed, [38], [241], 19. DARDANELLES, Allied fleets pass through, [241], 20. IZZET Pasha, Grand Vizier, [241]. MILITARY operations, [240]; Ministry, the new, [241]; Mohammed V., Sultan, Obit., [240], 12, 188. PRISONERS, British, treatment of, [241]. TEWFIK Pasha, Grand Vizier, [241]. VAHID-ED-DIN, Sultan, [240]
- TYRRELL, Sir W., appointed Assistant Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 18
- TYRWITT, Commodore Sir R. Y., appointed Acting Rear-Admiral, 2
- UKRAINIA, [9], [225], [228], [231]. BREST-LITOVSK Conference, [231]. DON Republic, Treaty with, [233]. GERMANY and Austria, agreement, [8], 3; peace signed, [9], [192], [214], [215], [232], 3. GOLUBOVITCH, M., President, [232]. "RADA" diet, [231]. RUSSIA, result of the secession to, [15]. SKOROPADSKY, Gen. P., President, [233]
- UNITED STATES.—ARMISTICE, [301]. Austria-Hungary, negotiations for peace, [295], [298]-[301]. BOLSHEVIST Government of Russia, relations broken, 14. CONSCRIPTION Act, [238], [293], [294]. DAVIS, J., appointed Ambassador in London, 16. ELECTION, General, [301]. Expenditure, [295]. GERMANY, negotiations for peace, [298]-[301], 17, 18, 19. HOOVER, Mr., Food Controller, mission in Europe, 15. INDEPENDENCE Day, celebrated, 12. LOANS, issue of, [295], [296]. MILITARY operations in France, [25], [32]-[36], [294]. PAGE, Dr., Ambassador in London, retirement, 15. Peace negotiations, [201]-[206], [214], [296]-[301], 16, 17, 18, 19. PERSHING, General, in command of the Army, [34], [294], 14. RICE, Sir C. Spring, British Ambassador at Washington, retirement, 1. Shipbuilding, [295]. WAR, preparations, [288], [293]; casualties, [294]. WILSON, President, visit to London, [107], [168], [302], 21; to Rome, 22; at Brest, [178], [302], 21; peace negotiations, [190], [193], [289], [292], [296]-[301]; message to Congress, [288]-[291]; on the speeches of Count Czernin and Count Hertling, [291]; at Baltimore, [292]; sails for France, [301], 21
- UNWIN, F., publication of "Alsace-Lorraine: Past, Present, and Future," 24-26
- URCOTT, Sir F. R., Obit., 196
- VICTORIA Crosses, award of, 6, 9.
- Vindictive*, H.M.S., sunk across Ostend harbour, [41], 8
- WAGES of women and men, committee of, inquiry on, 15
- WALES, H.R.H. Edward, Prince of, takes his seat in the House of Lords, 4; at Paris, 20; in Rome, [182]
- WALSH, Rt. Rev. Dr. W. Obit., 199
- WAR anniversary, the fourth, [129]
- Bonds, national, sale of, [57], [148], 1, 4, 5, 77; amount of subscriptions, [149], 14
- Cabinet, system, [95]
- Imperial, [98]; Dominion Ministers entertained, [99], 11; meetings, [124], [147], 11
- casualties, [46], 22
- cost of the, 78
- Council, Supreme, at Versailles, [58], [60], 8, 10, 19
- the European, [1]-[46]; military operations on the Western Front, [2], [21]-[36], 13, 16; in Italy, [2], [30], [220]; in the Balkans, [3], [36]-[38], 17; in Russia, [3], [101]-[12]; in the Middle East, [4]; Brest-Litovsk peace negotiations, [4]-[9], [194], [214], [229]; a Hinterland of Central Europe, [15]-[17]; at Sea, [17]-[19], [38]-[43]; in the Air, [19], [43]; hostilities cease, 19
- restrictions, relaxed, [152]
- Savings Certificates, issue of, [167], 77
- WARD, Mrs. H., "A Writer's Recollections," 38
- WARRE, Dr., Provost of Eton, resignation, 9
- WEBER, Sir H., Obit., 203
- WEBLEY-PARRY-PRYSE, Sir E., Obit., 197
- WEDDERBURN, Sir W., Obit., 162
- WEIR, Sir W., appointed Chief of the Air Staff, [81], 7
- WELLS, H. G., "Joan and Peter," 58
- WERTHEIMER, A., Obit., 187
- WEST, R., "The Return of the Soldier," 56
- WESTMINSTER, Central Hall, meeting, [156]
- WESTON, A., Obit., 198
- WHITE, Rt. Rev. G., "Thirty Years in Tropical Australia," 41

- WHITE, J. C., Obit., 166
 WILD, E., Obit., 170
 WILLIAMS, Rev. Canon O. L., Obit., 194
 WILLINGDON, Lord, appointed Governor of Madras, [272], 17
 WILSON, Gen. Sir H., appointed Chief of the Imperial Staff, 3
 WILSON, Sir J., Obit., 183
 WILSON, President, visit to London, [167], [168], [302], 21; entertained by King George V., [168], [302], 22; at the Guildhall, [168]; Carlisle, [168]; Manchester, [168], 22; Rome, 22; at Brest, [178], [302], 21; peace negotiations, [190], [193], [201]-[206], [214], [296]-[301]. *See* United States
 WIMBORNE, Lord, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, resignation, 8
 WINDSOR-CLIVE, Lieut.-Col. the Hon. G. H. W., Obit., 176
 WINSTON, J. C., publication of "In the Alaskan Wilderness," 42
 WINTOUR, U. F., appointed Controller of the Stationery Office, 16
 WOMEN, Enfranchisement, [52], [163]
 — workers, appeal for, [71], [102]; claims, [166]; wages, 15
 WORKERS and Soldiers' Delegates, Conference in Berlin, [211]; 21
 WYLIE, Major-Gen. H., Obit., 194
 WYVILL, M. D'A., Obit., 193
 YARMOUTH, bombardment of, 2
 YEAMES, W. F., Obit., 177
 YOUNG, F. E. M., "The Laws of Chance," 55
 YOUNG, S., Obit., 175

